DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 295 742 PS 017 395

TITLE	Department of Defense Onsite Child Care Initiative. Hearing before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations. House of Representatives, One Hundredth Congress, First Session.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U. S., Washington, D. C. House Committee on Government Operations.
PUB DATE	15 Dec 87
NOTE	92p.; Portions contain light/small type.
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402 (Stock No. 552-070-04014-5, $2.75).
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Child Development Centers; *Day Care; *Delivery Systems; Early Childhood Education; Family Day Care; Hearings; *Military Personnel; *Program Development; *Program Implementation
IDENTIFIERS	Civil Service; Congress 100th; *Department of Defense; *Federal Employees; General Services Administration

ABSTRACT

A hearing was held to examine the Department of Defense's on-site child care policies for uniformed and civilian personnel. Testimony concerned: (1) origins of the need for on-site or near-site child care among military personnel and characteristics of care provided; (2) aspects of service provision to civilian personnel working for the military services; (3) impact of parental leave legislation on child care services provided by the military; (4) expansion of child care services; (5) differences in constraints on service provision to military and civilian personnel; (6) the General Services Administration's (GSA) plans and projects for child care for Federal employees; and (7) background information about the GSA's involvement in providing day care services. Appended material submitted for the record includes: (1) correspondence; (2) questions and answers concerning the joint Department of Defense committee on child care in the Pentagon; (3) facts about Army child development center programs, Army Family Child Care, and supplemental programs and services; (4) implementation of individual education plans in child development services; and (5) overviews of the U.S. Marine Corps' Child Care Program, the Navy's Child Development Services, and, very briefly, the Air Force's Child Development Program. (RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

PS

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ONSITE CHILD CARE INITIATIVE

ED295742

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

HEARING

BEFORE A

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDREDTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

DECEMBER 15, 1987

Printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations

PS 017995

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

83-260 WASHINGTON : 1988

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

JACK BROOKS, Texas, *Chairman*

JOHN CONYERS, JR., Michigan
CARDISS COLLINS, Illinois
GLENN ENGLISH, Oklahoma
HENRY A. WAXMAN, California
TED WEISS, New York
MIKE SYNAR, Oklahoma
STEPHEN L. NEAL, North Carolina
DOUG BARNARD, JR., Georgia
BARNEY FRANK, Massachusetts
TOM LANTOS, California
ROBERT E. WISE, JR., West Virginia
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
EDOLPHUS TOWNS, New York
JOHN M. SPRATT, JR., South Carolina
JOE KOLTER, Pennsylvania
BEN ERDREICH, Alabama
GERALD D. KLECZKA, Wisconsin
ALBERT G. BUSTAMANTE, Texas
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
THOMAS C. SAWYER, Ohio
LOUISE M. SLAUGHTER, New York
BILL GRANT, Florida
NANCY PELOSI, California

FRANK HORTON, New York
ROBERT S. WALKER, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM F. CLINGER, JR., Pennsylvania
AL McCANDLESS, California
LARRY E. CRAIG, Idaho
HOWARD C. NIELSON, Utah
JOSEPH J. DioGUARDI, New York
JIM LIGHTFOOT, Iowa
BEAU BOULTER, Texas
DONALD E. "BUZ" LUKENS, Ohio
AMORY HOUGHTON, JR., New York
J. DENNIS HASTERT, Illinois
JON L. KYL, Arizona
JAMES M. INHOFE, Oklahoma
CHRISTOPHER SHAYS, Connecticut

WILLIAM M. JONES, *General Counsel*
DONALD W. UPSON, *Minority Staff Director*

GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES AND TRANSPORTATION SUBCOMMITTEE

CARDISS COLLINS, Illinois, *Chairwoman*

MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
ROBERT E. WISE, JR., West Virginia
JOE KOLTER, Pennsylvania
GERALD D. KLECZKA, Wisconsin
THOMAS C. SAWYER, Ohio

HOWARD C. NIELSON, Utah
J. DENNIS HASTERT, Illinois
DONALD E. "BUZ" LUKENS, Ohio

EX OFFICIO

JACK BROOKS, Texas

FRANK HORTON, New York

JOHN R. GALLOWAY, *Staff Director*
LAQUIETTA J. HARDY, *Professional Staff Member*
CECELIA MORTON, *Clerk*
KEN SALAETS, *Minority Professional Staff*

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearing held on December 15, 1987	1
Statement of:	
Collins, Hon. Cardiss, a Representative in Congress from the State of Illinois, and chairwoman, Government Activities and Transportation Subcommittee: Opening statement	1
Leonard, Barbara M., Special Assistant to the Administrator for Child Care and Development, General Services Administration	20
Lukeman, Lt. Gen. Anthony, USMC, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Military Manpower and Personnel Policy, accompanied by Barbara S. Pope, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Family Support, Education and Safety, and Clare E. Freeman, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Civilian Personnel Policy	3
Letters, statements, etc., submitted for the record by:	
Freeman, Clare E., Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Civilian Personnel Policy: Prepared statement	6-10
Leonard, Barbara M., Special Assistant to the Administrator for Child Care and Development, General Services Administration:	
OMB memorandum concerning day care and other material relative to the hearing	40-55
Prepared statement	23-27
Problems relating to establishment of child care policy/centers, and costs to open child care centers	38-39
Sites to be surveyed and possible opening of 25 locations in fiscal year 1988	34-37
Lukeman, Lt. Gen. Anthony, USMC, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Military Manpower and Personnel Policy: Prepared statement	6-10
Pope, Barbara S., Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Family Support, Education and Safety: Prepared statement	6-10
APPENDIX	
Material submitted for the record	57

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ONSITE CHILD CARE INITIATIVE

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1987

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES AND
TRANSPORTATION SUBCOMMITTEE
OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10 a.m., in room 2203, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Cardiss Collins (chairwoman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Cardiss Collins, Howard C. Nielson, and J. Dennis Hastert.

Also present: LaQuietta J. Hardy, professional staff member; Miles Q. Romney, counsel; Cecelia Morton, clerk; and Ken Salaets, minority professional staff, Committee on Government Operations.

OPENING STATEMENT OF CHAIRWOMAN COLLINS

Mrs. COLLINS. Good morning. This hearing of the Government Activities and Transportation Subcommittee will come to order.

The primary purpose for this hearing is to examine the Department of Defense onsite child care policies for uniformed and civilian personnel. The subcommittee recently distributed questionnaires to various Government agencies concerning onsite child care. Most agencies reported having one or, at best, two or three such centers.

DOD, however, somewhat to our surprise, reported that DOD currently operates 581 centers at 412 installations in this country and abroad that serve 95,000 children each day. DOD plans to open an onsite child care facility in the Pentagon by October 1988, and DOD, unlike any other Federal agency, contributes to the cost of operating such centers to help reduce tuition charges to a level that most parents can afford.

That latter point is especially important since most Federal agencies charge from $60 to $110 per week, compared to DOD's average charge of $50 per week. That in turn raises the question of why other Federal agencies do not similarly help support their onsite child care centers which otherwise would tend to be limited to two-parent, upper income families.

In discussing child care with the military, however, we will want to know more about its plans to provide onsite day care for nonuniformed employees who constitute the largest single component of the civilian Federal work force.

Our second witness will be from the General Services Administration. GSA has been asked to testify concerning its plans to facilitate the establishment of child care centers in GSA-controlled buildings.

Two months ago the subcommittee issued a report that pointed to a lack of effectiveness and organization within GSA concerning onsite child care. The report contained seven recommendations to enable GSA to facilitate and encourage the establishment of additional centers in GSA-controlled buildings.

Mr. Nielson, do you have an opening statement?

Mr. NIELSON. Yes, I do. Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

During the course of this subcommittee's previous hearings on the subject of child care in the Federal sector, it became quite evident that establishing child care centers in Federal buildings was easier said than done. It was clear that there were and still are numerous obstacles, not the least of which was motivating Federal officials to take seriously the congressional mandate to provide for on- or near-site child care where a need and interest for such could be identified. Accordingly, we issued a report that made a number of recommendations, as the chairwoman has mentioned, to try to tear down whatever resistance or reluctance still existed regarding child care.

I am pleased that GSA Administrator Terry Golden has really taken this issue to heart. Mrs. Leonard's appointment as Special Assistant for Child Care and Development and her appearance at this hearing is further evidence that the Federal Government's leadership vacuum in this area is finally getting filled. It is nice to know we now have allies in the Federal sector who are demonstrating their commitment through actions as well as words.

I would like to commend the Department of Defense. Apparently, we were not aware how great you were doing. We have a tendency to beat you over the head on a lot of other issues, but I want to applaud you in this case.

I do not know how we overlooked your accomplishments the first time around. Obviously you have put a lot of time and effort into developing child care services for your personnel. Hopefully your example and experience will make it easier for others who are also committed to establishing child care centers for Federal employees.

I want to commend you for offsetting the cost and making it easy for your people to take advantage of child care. The only criticism I would have, if I had one, was that it needs to be the same for nonmilitary employees, as well as for the military. It seems to me you should look at that as well.

I want to thank Chairwoman Collins for calling this hearing. Often, congressional committees spend a lot of time criticizing, as you know. Occasionally, even the witnesses get slapped around once in awhile, so to speak. It is a pleasure to have the opportunity to do some backslapping this time around. I want to welcome our witnesses and thank them in advance for taking the time to appear before us this morning. I would remind the chairwoman, "the wicked flee when no man pursueth." [Laughter.]

Mrs. COLLINS. Thank you. Will our witnesses come forward, please?

Our first panel is Lt. Gen. Anthony Lukeman; Ms. Barbara Pope; and Ms. Clare E. Freeman. I understand that Ms. Freeman is not here yet, so why do we not begin with you, General Lukeman?

STATEMENT OF LT. GEN. ANTHONY LUKEMAN, USMC, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL POLICY, ACCOMPANIED BY BARBARA S. POPE, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR FAMILY SUPPORT, EDUCATION AND SAFETY, AND CLARE E. FREEMAN, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR CIVILIAN PERSONNEL POLICY

General LUKEMAN. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman. It is a real privilege to be here. With your permission, we have a formal statement that we would like to enter in the record, and then I would like to make a few informal remarks.

Mrs. COLLINS. We will be more than happy to submit your full statement in the record, and ask you to summarize in 5 minutes or less.

General LUKEMAN. Thank you, ma'am.

We have a particular and a special interest in child care. It is an interest that has changed a great deal over the years as the makeup of military service has changed.

When I was a lieutenant in the fifties, our first-term marines—and this applies to the members of the other services, as well—were mostly single. They lived in the barracks. They needed to get permission of their first sergeant if they thought they wanted to get married, and they often got talked out of it.

Private Johnson would go to the first sergeant and say, "First Sergeant, I want to marry so-and-so," and the first sergeant would say, "Private Johnson, you are going to the field for 6 weeks." And then Johnson may or may not come back and get married.

There were few women in uniform—fewer still, military couples, and almost no single parents. For the most part, military people were stationed in relatively isolated areas where there wasn't a lot of employment outside the gate. Even if they wanted to, most wives did not work outside the home. Pay was low, particularly for first-term enlisted members, because it was held down artificially as part of the draft.

Inflation was also low, though, so the military society and its level of pay were pretty much in balance. Most people enlisted or were drafted into the Armed Forces for 2 years, and then they went back to civilian life, they could not afford to get married during those couple of years.

Military people who were married were almost all careerists and they were a small minority. They tended to live on base, if they could, because among other things, they liked the camaraderie. Everything they needed was there: Housing, schools, churches, grocery stores, the gas station, and so forth. I do not remember any child care centers, and there probably were not any.

Basically, the kids were at home or at school, because we were two-parent families and only one parent was employed. That changed gradually, but the event that gave it the most impetus was

the All-Volunteer Force—a social and military miracle which brought with it the need to recognize some new realities.

We have always been, more or less, paternalistic, taking care of our young people, being surrogate parents for 17- and 18-year-old young men and a few women—and a lot of them even younger than that, underage for military service, who faked their way into the services, because that is where they saw their opportunity. Taking care of people was fundamental. That is what the first sergeant was doing when he sent Private Johnson out to the field. He knew that Johnson could not afford to be married.

That imperative part of military life, looking out for our people, continued into the All-Volunteer Force, but it took a new tack. It adjusted a little to the individual serviceman and in increasing numbers, servicewomen. It came to recognize that it was much better to recruit good people and keep as many as we could than to just take people in for a couple of years and replace them and pay the price in turnover and training costs.

Most of that change took a few years to develop after the volunteer force began in the early seventies. Child care fit that pattern. We started enlisting most people for 4 years—some, even for 6. They were people who saw military service not as something that was potentially unavoidable, but as an alternative to other things right out of high school.

The military services saw young people as they were and started recruiting talent. If you want a capable, stable, nonpotsmoking, potentially self-starting, capable-of-learning, disciplined, willing to be self-sacrificing high school graduate to come into the service and stay with you, you need to appeal to a wide segment of young society. That segment includes men and women, many of whom will marry young, some of whom will be single parents, and many of whom expect two incomes.

On top of that, we had some unique circumstances that made a move toward child care and child development a special need. At any given time, many of our families are separated because one of the members is away from his or her home base with the unit, or the ship, or on temporary duty going to school, or using his talent somewhere else where he is needed. This geographical separation, required because of the military environment, puts a real burden on the working spouse who stays behind to care for the children.

Second, most military people still are very young compared with other large organizations, and young people have young children who cannot care for themselves.

Third, we have a worldwide military presence. To support that, we need to move people much more frequently than other organizations, and the families then need to seek out new child care centers.

At the same time, we do not do as good a job as we should at reimbursing our people for all the costs of those moves, so the pressures on the spouse to find a new job quickly is a fact; and that means also getting child care quickly.

Fourth, the number of women coming and staying in the services is increasing. We have many who are married, and we consider it our responsibility to help them with child care. We might not have felt that responsibility in times past for the spouse, but when the

mother wears a uniform it automatically becomes part of taking care of our own.

Fifth, single parents are a fact. Since the nature of military service is to live where you are needed rather than where you are raised, grandparents or other relatives just are not there to share the load. The grandparents are in Wichita and you are in Fort Benning.

Finally, off-base child care is often not available or too far distant or too expensive, and almost always lacking in some of the essentials such as care for very young children. As a result we got into child care and child development in a big way, mainly within the eighties. We now operate, as you mentioned, Madam Chairwoman, 581 centers at 412 locations for about 90,000 children a day.

We hold the costs down, to the extent possible, to make it affordable, but we also recognize that there is a large difference between real need on the one hand and convenience babysitting on the other hand, and we structure our program to emphasize the former.

Madam Chairwoman, thank you for your indulgence. We will be happy to answer your questions.

[The prepared statement of General Lukeman, Ms. Pope, and Ms. Freeman follows:]

STATEMENT

OF THE

DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARIES OF DEFENSE

FOR

CIVILIAN PERSONNEL POLICY

CLAIRE E. FREEMAN

MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL POLICY

LIEUTENANT GENERAL ANTHONY LUKEMAN, USMC

FAMILY SUPPORT, EDUCATION AND SAFETY

BARBARA SPYRIDON POPE

HEARINGS BEFORE THE

GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES AND TRANSPORTATION SUBCOMMITTEE

HOUSE GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS COMMITTEE

CONCERNING

FEDERAL EMPLOYEE CHILD CARE PROGRAMS

DECEMBER 15, 1987

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
UNTIL RELEASED BY THE
SUBCOMMITTEE

MADAM CHAIRWOMAN, WE ARE PLEASED TO BE HERE THIS MORNING TO OUTLINE FOR YOU THE PROGRESS THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE HAS MADE IN PROVIDING CHILD CARE ON MILITARY INSTALLATIONS THROUGHOUT THE WORLD. WE KNOW THAT THIS COMMITTEE IS INTERESTED IN CHILD CARE OPTIONS FOR THE FEDERAL WORKPLACE. WHILE THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE IS THE LARGEST FEDERAL EMPLOYER, AND MUST BE COMPETITIVE WITH THE PRIVATE SECTOR IN MEETING DEMANDS FOR CHILD CARE SERVICES, THE EMPHASIS THUS FAR HAS BEEN ON PROVIDING CARE FOR CHILDREN OF MILITARY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED SERVICES. WE ARE STILL TRYING TO MEET THESE NEEDS. LACK OF FACILITIES REMAINS A MAJOR PROBLEM. SOME INSTALLATIONS, HOWEVER, HAVE LIMITED CAPACITY TO ACCOMMODATE CHILDREN OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES AND DO SO ON A SPACE-AVAILABLE BASIS.

WE DO NOT KNOW WHEN THE FIRST CHILD CARE CENTER WAS OPENED ON A MILITARY INSTALLATION. WELL BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT ISSUED DIRECTIVES IN 1978, FORMALLY RECOGNIZING THE CHILD CARE PROGRAM, A NUMBER OF INITIATIVES HAD BEEN TAKEN AT INSTALLATION LEVEL TO MEET DEMANDS. MANY LOCAL COMMANDERS HAD MADE BUILDINGS AND EXCESS SPACE AVAILABLE TO WIVES' CLUBS, WHO WERE OPERATING CENTERS AS PARENTS' COOPERATIVES. IN OTHER CASES, CHAPLAINS AND MILITARY EXCHANGE MANAGERS HAD BEGUN TO OFFER DROP-IN CARE DURING CHAPEL ACTIVITIES OR WHILE PARENTS WERE SHOPPING. SOME OF THESE DROP-IN FACILITIES EVOLVED INTO CENTERS PROVIDING EXTENDED CARE THROUGHOUT THE DAY.

In 1978, we brought child care centers into the DoD morale, welfare, and recreation (MWR) program and authorized the military Services to provide appropriated fund support as well as nonappropriated fund support.

Improvements did not come quickly or easily. In 1981, the General Accounting Office (GAO) surveyed child care centers on military installations and issued a report dated June 1, 1982. In that report, the GAO noted that many of the facilities which had been made available for child care centers were neither safe nor suitable for these programs. Many needed upgrading to comply with fire, safety, and sanitation standards. The Department's Action Plan, prepared in response to the GAO recommendations, resulted in major improvements in the quality of care during the mid-1980s. Appropriated funds were authorized for construction of new facilities and for renovation or repair of existing buildings. Qualitative program standards were established. We made a commitment to developmental care. Staff training materials - developed in cooperation with the then Department of Health, Education and Welfare - were published and distributed to all child care centers. On-base family day care programs were encouraged in order to supplement center capacity and to provide military spouses with in-home employment and income.

Currently, the Department operates 581 centers on 412 military installations throughout the world. Average daily

ATTENDANCE EXCEEDS 90,000. THE TOTAL COST OF OPERATING THESE CENTERS IS APPROXIMATELY $115 MILLION. ABOUT 30 PERCENT OF OPERATING COSTS, OR $34.4 MILLION, IS PROVIDED FROM APPROPRIATED FUNDS. NONAPPROPRIATED FUNDS, MOSTLY FEES AND CHARGES PAID BY PARENTS, DEFRAY APPROXIMATELY 70 PERCENT OF OPERATING COSTS. THE APPROPRIATED FUND SUPPORT - DIRECTORS' SALARIES, UTILITIES, SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT, AND BUILDING MAINTENANCE - PERMIT THE DEPARTMENT TO KEEP FEES AT MOST INSTALLATIONS IN THE $40-$60 PER WEEK RANGE. THESE FEES ARE AFFORDABLE TO JUNIOR ENLISTED PERSONNEL, WHO COMPRISE THE MAJORITY OF OUR USERS.

WE SHOULD ALSO MENTION, MADAM CHAIRWOMAN, THAT MOST OF OUR CENTERS PROVIDE INFANT CARE AND HOURLY OR DROP-IN CARE. THESE ARE SERVICES THAT CHILD CARE CENTERS IN CIVILIAN COMMUNITIES NORMALLY DO NOT OFFER.

WE ARE PROUD OF THESE EFFORTS, BUT WE RECOGNIZE, TOO, THAT MUCH REMAINS TO BE DONE. AT MANY INSTALLATIONS THERE ARE LONG LISTS OF MILITARY PARENTS WAITING TO ADMIT THEIR CHILDREN. THE GAO IS CURRENTLY ENGAGED IN A SURVEY TO DETERMINE THE EXTENT OF THIS BACKLOG AND ITS EFFECT ON READINESS. THE SUPPORT OF THE CONGRESS WILL BE NEEDED TO BUILD ADDITIONAL FACILITIES AND TO CONTINUE TO PROVIDE OPERATIONAL SUPPORT. OVER THE PAST TWELVE MONTHS WE JOINED THE GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION, OTHER FEDERAL AND STATE AGENCIES, AND PRIVATE CORPORATIONS IN A MAJOR EFFORT TO GATHER INFORMATION AS A FIRST STEP TO ADDRESS THE CHILD CARE NEEDS OF OUR MEMBERS. IN OCTOBER OF THIS YEAR WE

ESTABLISHED A COMMITTEE COMPOSED OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM EACH MAJOR DoD ORGANIZATION TO EXAMINE ALTERNATIVES FOR ADDRESSING CHILD CARE NEEDS IN THE WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA IN GENERAL AND THE PENTAGON IN PARTICULAR. THE COMMITTEE HAS SET A SEPTEMBER 1, 1988, TARGET DATE FOR PROVIDING CHILD CARE AT OR NEAR THE PENTAGON. THE EXPERIENCE GAINED BY THIS COMMITTEE SHOULD BE USEFUL AT OTHER LOCATIONS, TO INCLUDE WORK SITES IN GOVERNMENT-OWNED OR LEASED BUILDINGS THAT ARE NOT ON MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.

AS WITH PAST EFFORTS, EXPANDING CHILD CARE SERVICES TO MEET MORE OF THE NEEDS OF OUR MILITARY MEMBERS WILL NOT BE AN EASY TASK. INDEED, IT IS A FORMIDABLE CHALLENGE. AND IT WILL REQUIRE THE BEST EFFORTS OF ALL OF US.

Mrs. COLLINS. Thank you.

Ms. Pope.

Ms. POPE. I am not going to give an opening statement.

Mrs. COLLINS. You do not have an opening statement. All right. Ms. Freeman.

Ms. FREEMAN. I also do not have a statement. We are really sharing in General Lukeman's statement, but we are here to answer questions.

Mrs. COLLINS. All right.

I think my first question would be, can you tell us the kinds of child care services that are available for military personnel?

General LUKEMAN. I will start, and Ms. Pope may want to add.

Ms. POPE. Sure.

General LUKEMAN. It runs the whole range, Mrs. Collins, from infant care, toddlers, preschoolers, permanent-type care where both spouses are working and an arrangement is made for weekly care, to where the facilities permit it, some drop-in care for the spouse who, for example, may be going to the commissary.

Ms. POPE. Let me add also——

Mrs. COLLINS. I will in just a second, but the ranking member is pointing out that Ms. Freeman has a written statement which, with unanimous consent, we will make a part of the record.

General LUKEMAN. It is a joint statement, and we ask that it be entered in the record, sir.

Mr. NIELSON. I thought it was a separate statement, excuse me.

Ms. FREEMAN. No; it is a joint statement.

Mrs. COLLINS. All right. Thank you.

Ms. POPE. The other thing that the military services provide is respite care for sick children, which a lot of the civilian child care centers do not, especially with single parents and dual-career parents, there is no option.

As General Lukeman mentioned, there is not an extended family to take care of that child when he or she is sick. The other thing that the services have been very creative about is home-based day care. We have been training family home providers. There are now about 9,300 on-base homes certified to provide child care. It allows more—it addresses the latchkey issue. It addresses some of the infant problems. It also, for the military, provides training for spouses, a transferable skill for the spouses to take as they are uprooted; it addresses a need for day care, and it also addresses the spouse employment issue.

Mrs. COLLINS. The 9,300 homes are in addition to the 90-or-so-thousand children who are in the centers themselves.

Ms. POPE. Yes.

Mrs. COLLINS. Do you have any kind of special—what is your base curriculum and so forth?

Ms. POPE. They receive some training. There was a person——

Mrs. COLLINS. How young do you take them?

Ms. POPE. The children? Or the home care givers?

Mrs. COLLINS. Infants.

Ms. POPE. I believe it is 4 weeks, because military members, in the Marine Corps especially, go back to duty after 4 weeks. So we have to provide care for infants, since we are requiring servicewomen to come back to active duty.

They are overseen through the child care development centers. It costs us about $45,000 a year for one GS employee to oversee somewhere between 20 and 30 homes. There may be a toy library where people can check out toys, so that is not an out-of-pocket cost. So family day care it is one of the needs, because we do not have enough money to provide for formal child care development centers everywhere.

Some people have only a latchkey problem. They have a problem with children after school. There are not enough spaces available for the infants. So I think the services also ought to get credit for that population.

Mrs. COLLINS. Now what is the upper age limit for children in the child care centers?

General LUKEMAN. Twelve years old. And in addition to what Ms. Pope said, the 4 weeks is minimum age only in some homes. Other homes and in the child care centers, it is 6 weeks. In some places, they just do not have either the population of children or care givers to take care of infants.

Mrs. COLLINS. Then what happens in a case like that where you have a two-parent family and you have a child who is below minimum age and there are not any slots in the child care centers? Are they then recommended for home care?

General LUKEMAN. It will be the parents' decision. The parent will either go outside the base for care, or use a friend, or go for home care, or do whatever he or she has to do.

Mrs. COLLINS. Well, would home care be a first option for them? Or would that be final care? Somebody in the back is going like this [audience member nodding in the affirmative]. I take it the answer is "yes"?

General LUKEMAN. Yes.

Mrs. COLLINS. Is that right, Ms. Freeman?

Ms. FREEMAN. Actually, I do not have any information on military child care. So I would have to——

Ms. POPE. The dual group family has top priority.

Mrs. COLLINS. Tell me a little bit more about the home based care. How does this work? Who are the people who take care of the home? Are they people my age, grandmothers like me, or what? How does that work?

Ms. POPE. It is all ages. There are people who come in that are——

Mrs. COLLINS. Starting at what age?

Ms. POPE. I would imagine as early as teens, married spouses. They are spouses of military members.

Mrs. COLLINS. They are spouses? OK.

Ms. POPE. And they are in onbase housing. One of the advantages we have with onbase housing is that we can also do fire inspection and safety inspections, so the base provides that service.

Mrs. COLLINS. Do you do that frequently?

Ms. POPE. Yes. How frequently, I do not know.

General LUKEMAN. It is growing. We are growing into this program. The inspection and supervision of the home care program is something that gives us a great deal of concern, and it varies from place to place.

Mrs. COLLINS. What would a home care provider do besides sort of babysit the children, feed them, change diapers? Would they have any responsibilities for any developmental types of things with the child or children?

Ms. POPE. Yes; they get training. They are given reading materials, and they periodically come back in for discussions and additional training. It is not as developed as a child development center. Many times it is less expensive, and a lot of times that is what the parents need, also.

Sometimes it is more accessible. It may be the nextdoor neighbor, which is an added advantage.

Mrs. COLLINS. My time has expired.

Mr. Nielson.

Mr. NIELSON. Yes; I notice in your statement, on page 2, you say that the main emphasis has been on providing care for children of the military members of the armed services, and you mentioned the reason for that, and I appreciate that. You add, however, that some installations have limited capacity to accommodate children of Department of Defense civilian employees and that they do so on a space-available basis.

What percentage of these 95,000 would you say would be civilian-employee related rather than military?

General LUKEMAN. I do not have a good fix on it, Mr. Nielson. We anticipated that question, but do not have readily available records from which we can ascertain civilian employee use of onbase child care centers. I will say that it is very low because capacity is the major problem in the child care area.

Ms. POPE. One of the things, in discussing it, was that there are a lot of dual-career couples, a lot of spouses who are working in civilian jobs who are married to military members. So some of those children are counted as a military child when in fact the spouse may also be working in a civilian job, and we do not have a good handle on that.

Mr. NIELSON. I am about to celebrate the 45th anniversary of my induction into the U.S. Army Air Force, and so I am sure you are talking about the period of time when marriage was discouraged and the military wives were supposed to get lost, and if they were there, they had to live off base somewhere.

Do you find that the military serves as well now when their wives accompany them on these trips as they formerly did when spouses were left at home? Is there any decrease in the ability of the military, either because the wives are along——

General LUKEMAN. None whatsoever, sir. None, whatsoever.

Mr. NIELSON. I am glad to hear you say that, General.

General LUKEMAN. I would say it is probably the reverse.

Mr. NIELSON. The reverse.

Now as for the civilian employees, we have a tremendous military-civilian force—that is, civilians working for the Department of Defense, I should say. Are not many of them in the same situation as the military? That is, they are transferred from various places? I know when I was serving in Germany, there were a lot of civilian defense people, as well. Are they not also transferred around a little bit? And do they not have the same problems taking care of their wives and children as do the military?

Ms. FREEMAN. They have very similar problems, but certainly they are not transferred against their will, or just because it is a part of their duty. They usually seek the transfers for upward mobility opportunity or something of that sort. I would say that is a very different job situation and job opportunity situation than the military.

Mr. NIELSON. What about the parents' cooperatives? A lot of the women get together and tend each other's children and rotate the care. How does that work out? When you cannot provide a child care center, are you able to provide an alternative so the women can cooperate on child care?

Ms. POPE. We have encouraged families to do that. Part of the problem with parent cooperatives, whether it is a formal child development center or if it is five mothers who are getting together themselves, is that the parents rotate so frequently that to establish a cooperative—as soon as it is established, one of the parents is out and you have to find another person to come in. So cooperatives on the military side do not work as well.

Mr. NIELSON. I see. You mentioned this is primarily for those who live on base. In other words, it is easier to handle because they live on base and their families are in housing on the base. What about those who live off base and live in on the local economy who may have the same problem? They are military but they live off the base somewhere. How do they handle the problem?

Ms. POPE. The military members that—are you talking about the home-based care?

Mr. NIELSON. I am talking about a member of the military who does not live on the base, who has to deal with the economy, and yet may have the same problem as far as having children taken care of, and whose spouse may need some assistance. How can she or he get help?

Ms. POPE. They still have access to the onbase child development center.

Mr. NIELSON. They do?

Ms. POPE. It is not a requirement to live on base to attend. The requirement for on base are for home-based day care. If it is a private sector home off base, we then have State regulations. We cannot go out and inspect——

Mr. NIELSON. No, I was not referring to having the child center off base. I still think they could bring the children to the base.

Ms. POPE. They do.

Mr. NIELSON. But I got the impression from your comment that it is so much easier to handle if they lived on base, and that sounded a little discriminatory.

Ms. POPE. No; I apologize. That was not what I meant to say. I was addressing the home based, or family based day care.

Mr. NIELSON. I see.

Ms. POPE. Those who live on base we can oversee.

Mr. NIELSON. I appreciate your clarification. Thank you, very much.

One other question. The chairwoman raised this point. How many——

Mrs. COLLINS. The gentleman can certainly finish his question.

Mr. NIELSON. What is your ratio of people who supply the care to the number of infants they have to take care of?

Ms. POPE. In family day care homes or in the child development centers?

Mr. NIELSON. In the child development center.

General LUKEMAN. I have some numbers here.

Ms. POPE. Infants are 1 to 5. In most of the States, it is 1 to 4, or 1 to 3. We are looking at trying to reduce that number a little bit.

Mr. NIELSON. One to five? You mean you can handle five infants? I want to meet the person who can do that. [Laughter.]

General LUKEMAN. We have a chart here, Mr. Nielson, which we will put in the record, but Barbara Pope was correct. Up to 18 months, it is 1 to 5. Up to 3 years, that is 1 to 8. Up to 5 years, 1 to 12. Up to 9 years, 1 to 15. Up to 12 years, 1 to 18.

Mr. NIELSON. I commend you for what you are doing, but you need more people to help. That 1 to 5 figure is a very difficult ratio. You are going to lose personnel eventually. They will wear out.

I thank you very much.

Mrs. COLLINS. Mr. Hastert.

Mr. HASTERT. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman. There are just a couple of things I would like to clear up.

In your statement you mentioned that most people who use the service obviously are the junior enlisted people. Are the rates prorated?

General LUKEMAN. Generally not. It is a service decision on that, and a base commander has a lot of authority within the service regulations. What we try to do is keep all the rates low, and generally—although not always—we would give a break for somebody with more than one child. The average rate, as the chairwoman said, was about $50 a week. A second child might, in many cases, be less than that.

Mr. HASTERT. Do you have a lot of centers located overseas?

General LUKEMAN. Yes, we do. I do not know what the percentage is.

Mr. HASTERT. Of those centers overseas, are you subject to different types of licensing standards?

General LUKEMAN. No; we run them completely with Department of Defense standards.

Mr. HASTERT. In the various States—I know the State that I come from has rather stringent day care standards—are you tied into State standards?

Ms. POPE. No. No, because they are on base we abide by the DOD regulations.

Mrs. COLLINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTERT. Yes.

Mrs. COLLINS. What about the ones where the care is in the home? Do you not have to follow the State requirements in those cases?

Ms. POPE. Not normally, because it is onbase housing.

Mrs. COLLINS. Oh, it is all base housing? I see. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HASTERT. Yes, I will reclaim my time for just one question.

We do have a bill moving through Congress right now, the parental leave bill, and there is a debate whether that should be tied

to—Federal employees should be tied to that, or they should not be tied to that. We have a habit of sometimes passing bills where we exempt ourselves from them. If that bill was passed, it certainly would affect your operation militarily, would it not?

General LUKEMAN. Yes, it would.

Mr. HASTERT. How?

General LUKEMAN. It would limit the flexibility that we have now to assign members, and for the individual commanding officer to control his people. We believe that we are probably as enlightened as anyone in or out of the Federal Government on parental leave policies. So, in general, we do not like that kind of guidance.

Mr. HASTERT. Thank you, very much.

Thank you, Madam Chairwoman.

Mrs. COLLINS. Thank you.

Can you tell me, please, what the minimum qualifications for the care givers, both administrators and care givers, have to possess before they can be hired? Perhaps Ms. Freeman could tell us that.

Ms. FREEMAN. Yes; for the director, for example, or for the professional staff of a child care developmental center, the guidelines are very similar to any other civil service hiring practice guidelines. There are minimum qualifications. Each military service, however, develops its own set of qualifications, and they follow basically the private sector guidelines for child care center directors.

For the lower level child care giver person, there are also minimum standards set by each individual service. So the Department of Defense does not set the standards. Each service sets the standards for those particular jobs.

Mrs. COLLINS. Is there a central area someplace, or a central person someplace who looks at the individual services' minimum requirements to determine whether they are in keeping with what they think they should be?

Ms. FREEMAN. Currently, we do not have that. Each service takes care of its own.

Mrs. COLLINS. What is the process by which prospective child care employees are screened before employment?

Ms. FREEMAN. They are screened in the typical way all our civil service employees are screened. They answer an ad, for example, for a merit promotion advertisement, and they are screened first by the civilian personnel officer of that particular base, and then they are interviewed by the commanding general and other people who would have a hand in hiring that person.

Mrs. COLLINS. Is a part of that screening process to see if they have ever been incarcerated for felonies or anything of that nature?

Ms. FREEMAN. Yes. There would be a standard civil service employment form that includes that kind of question.

Mrs. COLLINS. So frequently we seem to have been, from time to time in the last year or so throughout a number of cities, been faced with newspaper articles indicating that there has been sexual abuse of children in child care centers. Has there been any such experience, General, in the military?

General LUKEMAN. Yes, there has been.

Mrs. COLLINS. And what steps were taken to eliminate that situation?

General LUKEMAN. I think it varies from place to place. In the case of the one that was most newsworthy recently, the center was actually closed while corrective action was being taken. The commanding general looked at the whole program, and in fact the military service headquarters looked at the problem from top to bottom.

Mrs. COLLINS. You mentioned the fees in Mr. Hastert's question. Are these just flat fees, or are they sliding scale fees?

General LUKEMAN. They generally are not sliding scale, although the base commander has a great deal of flexibility. In some cases, they are sliding scale, but generally they are not.

Mrs. COLLINS. Who is responsible for hiring the staff in these child care centers?

Ms. FREEMAN. The civilian personnel office screens them, but the office that runs the child care center would have the final say of who gets hired.

Mrs. COLLINS. I understand you are planning to open up some more child care centers—one here in the Pentagon, for example, General. How many are on the drawing board right now? How many more?

General LUKEMAN. I can tell you that in the fiscal year 1988 budget we have plans to build 12 new centers, and in the 1989 budget we have plans to build 24 additional. Ms. Pope has more knowledge of the Pentagon than I do.

Mrs. COLLINS. Ms. Pope.

Ms. POPE. The Pentagon one we are working with the civilian personnel office to identify our clientele. We have a similar problem that both the House and the Senate have faced in coming up with such a high quality center that you cannot service a GS-4 employee.

What I can afford for my child is different from what that lower-level GS employee can afford. So we are in the process of sending out a survey to our population who are interested in a day care center so that we can make a decision on what the fees will be, what services are going to be provided, and how many children are going to be able to be taken in.

We have been working with the civilian personnel office as kind of a test for the Pentagon for the Department of Defense so that we can then set up a model. There are a lot of civilian organizations at the military installations that have already gone out because of needs that have established parent co-ops that have looked to addressing the private sector and having someone come in and contract out a child development center.

We are also in the process of finding out what else is working out there for our civilian employees.

Mrs. COLLINS. Mr. Nielson.

Mr. NIELSON. Yes; thank you. I understand you have a handbook about child care centers, and some instructions about it. Would you make those available to the committee for our files? We would appreciate that.

[Instruction handbooks are on file in subcommittee office.]

Mr. NIELSON. Ms. Pope, you mentioned that you are looking at the Pentagon. They have the same set of problems we have in the House and Senate. Would you get some information and find out

what the costs would be, the actual fees you think you would have to charge, and maybe compare that with what the House of Representatives is charging for theirs?

Also, would you let me know what percentage of the cost is being subsidized by the Defense Department. In other words, I understand military personnel get fairly heavily subsidized, and when you provide for civilian employees, that they pay the entire costs. I would like to get the actual costs the two groups pay, if you could do that.

Ms. POPE. Sure. The Pentagon child care center is not going to be subsidized at all. Part of what we are allowed to do for a military child care development center is to subsidize that with soldiers' dollars, with our welfare dollars, so that soldiers' dollars go back into the operation of those.

We do not have the flexibility with the civilian child care center.

Mr. NIELSON. I do not have any other questions, but let me just comment on two things.

First of all, I commend you considerably. I commend you for doing this for the military particularly. I would like to encourage you to do it also for your civilian employees. Some other agencies have done a good job—the Post Office, and others—have done a good job for civilian personnel, and I appreciate your attempting that at the Pentagon. I think wherever you have a substantial number of civilian employees, I think it would be well to investigate the need for onsite child care.

We have found that GSA is cooperating very well with all the agencies, and I certainly commend them as far as that goes.

I would like you to do two other things: One, I would like you to try to accommodate more children, or that is, have more personnel to take care of them. I do not think a 5-to-1 ratio is adequate. I think 2 or 3 to 1 is usually the ratio at private centers, and at the infant level of less than 2 years old. And speaking as a grandfather of 24, and having had family reunions where all 24 have been present, it takes all 15 adults to take care of those 24. And that is a ratio considerably different from the 5 to 1. [Laughter.]

So I would just pass that on with my own experience, that 5 to 1 is not an adequate ratio. So try to divert funds, or consolidate, or do something else in order to have more people available to take care of the children, because I really do not think it should be just a custodial situation. That is about all you can do with a 5-to-1 ratio, and that is why I would suggest working on that particular angle.

Thank you very much, and I commend you for the work you are doing.

Ms. POPE. Mr. Nielson, rest assured we are looking at it. We are trying to bring that ratio down. Part of our problem is that as we bring that ratio down, the costs are going to go up.

Mr. NIELSON. I understand that. But I still think that is money well spent, if your objective is to find meaningful, good care for these children while their parents are working in the military or to supplement the family income.

Ms. POPE. We are subsidizing as much as we can out of our money. The problem is the costs that will go up will be to the parent, and that is their concern. I would also encourage you to

come out and visit some of the child development centers that we have got on military bases. If anything, my concern would be that some of the staff might burn out, because we do have very creative people on the staff, and there is an amazing amount of child development that is going on in those centers.

And as a parent of one 4-month-old who keeps two parents, two adults, full-time exhausted, I share your concern.

Mr. NIELSON. 1 to 2, in other words. [Laughter.]

Thank you very much.

Mrs. COLLINS. Mr. Hastert.

Mr. HASTERT. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman.

I think it is important that you have taken the approach, and it is certainly the goal of our Marine Corps or any of the services to keep the esprit de corps high, and certainly we are better if we can keep people in the process for a long period of time. I think child care, among other things, are incentives that we can use to keep at least the family functional and our fighting men and women on line.

So I salute you three for the work you are doing. Although there are debates on ratios and how you should do this and how you should do that, I would think that if you keep the long-term goal to keep those people happy and keep our fighting men and women in line with their family and support, I think that is a good approach and I salute you for it. Thank you.

Mrs. COLLINS. Well, obviously it is clear that all of us think you have done a fine job in the Department of Defense, and could certainly hold that up as an example to other agencies within the Federal Government to do something very similar, or to show the kind of commitment that you have to relieving the child care problem which is enormous for every working parent in our Nation as more and more two-parent families are engaging in employment. So it is just something that is very important.

I, too, want to commend you for the job that you have done. I also want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Utah that it is a problem that is needed not only with the uniformed personnel, but with the civilian personnel.

There are, of course, certain problems that would be inherent, particularly in foreign countries, I am sure, and I am almost sure, I guess, that you have some kind of way of taking those things into consideration when child care centers are under discussion to be opened in places off the continental United States, for example. But I think that you are doing a good job.

As the gentlemen have said, it is so infrequent that we get a chance to say that, that it is a new experience and that is why we are stumbling over our words, but we certainly thank you for coming, and we will get to our next panel now.

Thank you very much.

General LUKEMAN. Thank you, ma'am.

Mrs. COLLINS. Our next witness will be Ms. Barbara M. Leonard, who is the Special Assistant to the Administrator for Child Care and Development for the General Services Administration.

Welcome, Ms. Leonard. You may give your testimony at this time. Your full testimony will be made a part of the record, and you can summarize in 5 minutes or less.

STATEMENT OF BARBARA M. LEONARD, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE ADMINISTRATOR FOR CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT, GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Ms. LEONARD. I have submitted my written report for the record, and with your permission will make a few remarks now and then address any questions that you may have.

Mrs. COLLINS. Thank you.

Ms. LEONARD. I welcome this opportunity to tell you about GSA, its plans and projects for child care for Federal employees.

In 1976, Congress passed legislation that enabled agencies to make a request for space from GSA on a space-available basis to build child care centers, provided that 90 percent of those spaces would be reserved for children of Federal employees.

In 1985, Congress amended that law so that some equipment could be included, and agencies could be moved to make space for child care centers, and also space could be leased if it was necessary, and only 50 percent of the children's parents had to be Federal employees.

Shortly after Terence Golden became the Administrator of General Services, approximately 2 years ago, he introduced his quality space program for Federal buildings, which included space initiatives for physical fitness centers and child care centers.

Both the Federal Government and the private sector have been slow in realizing the extent of the need for increased child care facilities.

Only in the last year have reliable studies shown the astonishing growth of the number of women in the workplace with children under 5 years. Fifty-two percent of mothers who work have children under 5 years old, and it is estimated by the early 1990's that that it will be 70 percent. Mr. Golden has made the building of child care centers a top priority for GSA. We will take a proactive role in central office and in the field, and we have contacted and met with HHS for child care program information and assistance. They have valuable experience with their Head Start programs that GSA and other Federal agencies can use.

Mr. Golden asked me to fill this newly created position as special assistant to him for the development of child care facilities in the Federal Government. When I saw the great need and the exciting challenge, I accepted this position about 6 weeks ago, with eagerness.

Last week we had senior GSA executives in from all the regions, and they are to give in their regions this child care initiative their top priority. They will be responsible for this priority in their region. On January 6, we will meet in an all-day session in Washington with the senior people from all Federal agencies to further promote our program and inform them of the aid and assistance that GSA can give on how to proceed quickly with their addressing employee's child care needs.

My job is to act as a catalyst and a facilitator to the building of child care centers in those cities with a significant Federal presence, and to encourage and to help form partnerships of Federal agencies. I can think of several partnerships that have already occurred such as the new center in the GSA building, in which the

Department of the Interior, the Office of Personnel Management (OPM), and the GSA were involved; I have here an invitation to an opening in Rhode Island as cosponsors of the Sea Urchin's Child Care Center. In this center, the Environmental Protection Agency was involved, the National Marine Fisheries, the YMCA, and the University of Rhode Island Oceanographic Institute.

I personally think that this consortium idea is something that I and the GSA will aggressively pursue. It allows more resources and costs to be shared, and it gives smaller agencies a better opportunity to participate. Further, I see nothing in the law which would preclude Federal agencies from forming similar partnerships with city and State entities, with institutions such as hospitals, and with even the private sector. We will all benefit.

I will hurry along, because I want you to hear about this.

Mr. NIELSON. I ask unanimous consent that she have an extra 5 minutes.

Mrs. COLLINS. Without objection.

Ms. LEONARD. All right. Thank you.

I think we must not only hasten the process because the need is so immediate, but we must use imaginative and creative means to get the job done quickly, and Mr. Golden fully concurs with this.

I will stress the concept of partnership and cooperative effort in my talks around the country. I will enumerate the benefits to agency heads, union leaders, women's groups, Federal executive boards, and any agency that needs and seeks our help.

Let me just mention a few of the reasons beyond the need of children and parents for the greatly increased interest in child care centers by both public and private America.

The Government and the private sector have started to experience a very tight labor market. Increased turnover and absenteeism have added significantly to the cost of doing business. Some have estimated these costs between $5,000 and $10,000 each in the lower and middle positions. The costs are due to loss of efficiency and productivity caused by these turnovers. It is true in both the private and public sector.

Enlightened self-interest made onsite child care attractive to employers. Child care centers will help to attract and keep employees. Also, it makes for a happier work force with a higher morale. Thus, a more stable work force. A good example is the Internal Revenue Service. In conjunction with our program, they are planning to build many centers throughout the United States. They had experienced difficulty in performing their mission because of the lack of staff and the high turnover. IRS managers feel child care facilities will stabilize their work force.

To parents, onsite child care is an incentive to stay put. They like to be involved in the operation of a center. They like to be able to see what the center is providing for their child, and they like to visit the children for an occasional lunch or a walk.

The building of child care facilities is a No. 1 priority with GSA, and No. 2 is the establishment of resource information centers in each area for the use of agencies, providers, and Federal parents. Such information would include what are local laws and building codes for building child care centers? What are the regulations for the ratio of children to care givers? What, if any, subsidies of schol-

arships of Federal, State, or city, are available to parents to help with the costs?

Compared to the pace of public and private involvement in child care a year ago, I would say that at the present time there is a ferment throughout the land to increase the number of centers, and also to reduce the costs of child care to the users. State governments have instituted low-cost loans to companies and developers. They have given tax incentives. They have increased aid to lower income parents by providing tuition vouchers, by making special help available on a sliding scale, and other direct subsidies.

The Federal Government has tax credits, and there is talk of increasing those tax credits for child care. The Job Training Partnership Act offers child care subsidies to people who are displaced homemakers who need child care during job skills training and for going back into the job market, and now our GSA program.

The Combined Federal Campaign is also a potential source of support for child care. Federal employees can designate their dollars to a child care center for use in funding scholarships. Certain unions—and I think this will grow—have solicited the members for amounts to be given toward establishing scholarships for the children of their members. Onsite or nearsite child care is good for our employees, and for their children. It has benefits to our Government agencies. By the commitment of resources, the dedication of people, and a sense of the urgency, we in GSA will get the job done.

I welcome any of your questions that you may have.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Leonard follows:]

STATEMENT OF

BARBARA M. LEONARD

SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE ADMINISTRATOR

FOR CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES AND TRANSPORTATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

DECEMBER 15, 1987

I am pleased to be here today to share with you some details of a very important and exciting program initiative of the General Services Administration. I refer, of course, to child care centers for children of Federal employees. I have been appointed by the Administrator of General Services, Terence C. Golden to implement GSA'S commitment to the opening of these centers. As the largest single employer in the United States, our Government is now taking a strong lead in identifying and meeting the need for quality child care facilities.

In brief, the General Services Administration is taking a proactive role in encouraging the establishment, in the near term, of on-site or nearby child care centers to meet Federal employees' needs.

Why should GSA be actively promoting child care centers in the Federal workplace?

Certainly, the testimony of witnesses and a GAO Report cited by this Committee in its report of October 2, 1987, entitled "Child Care in Federal Buildings," said it best. In speaking of the new dimensions of the workforce, Sandra Burud, Chairwoman of Summa Associates, Inc. said:

> "The work force has changed. The traditional family that old workplace policies were designed for---A breadwinning father, a breadmaking mother and two breadeating kids---is now only 11 percent of the population. Two thirds of women with children under 3 years old are working full-time."

A report of the General Accounting Office has said,

> "The American work force has changed dramatically over the past three decades. In 1950, only 12 percent of mothers with children were in the labor force. By 1984, 52 percent were employed. Today the majority of American children--more than 22 million---are growing up in homes where both parents, or the sole parent is employed outside the home."

The ever increasing numbers of women in the American work force generally, and the Federal work force specifically, have caused a significant reexamination of the need for child care in the workplace. Concern for the welfare of their children is the single most important issue that working parents face. The many child care-related problems encountered by working parents often affect work performance and attendance. It is difficult to fully concentrate on your job when you are worried about the care and safety of your child.

Recognizing that their corporate interests are served by helping their employees find quality child care, some progressive employers in the private sector are establishing on-site child care centers to assist their employees. The Federal government, through its GSA child care initiative program, is taking a leadership role in making convenient child care centers available for our federal employees.

In the past, the General Services Administration played a largely passive role in providing on-site child care centers. Our involvement centered around the provision of space on an "as-available" basis.

GSA is immediately taking steps toward meeting this new objective. We have developed a child care needs assessment survey which seeks to determine the number of potential users of the center, their expectations and desires for the child care program, their requirements related to hours of operation, location, and other factors.

The procedures GSA follows for design and construction contracting is an often lengthy and cumbersome process. We are attempting to streamline and modify the procedures. We have set a goal to build these much needed centers in record time. GSA has given this program throughout the United States a high priority.

GSA proposes to build out space to include necessary fixtures and design features required for a licensed child care center. Child sized sinks and toilets, storage facilities, and other features would be included in GSA's initial renovation. Consumable supplies and equipment, such as finger paint and toys, are the responsibility of the provider of the child care program. The tuition paid by these parents will pay the costs of the child care centers.

GSA will maintain in each region a file of local sources for technical guidance and help, and names of local child care service providers. Thus, sponsoring agencies and parents' boards can have readily available information resources.

Establishment of child care centers is a cooperative effort between GSA and other Federal agencies. We will not only make space available, but we will also encourage the development of child care centers that serve as learning centers. We will assist other Federal agencies in seeking out the best guidance (experts in the child development field) and encourage the setting and maintaining of high standards for these centers.

GSA will provide space when needs exist, anticipating that such child care centers will assist children develop good habits of learning and living that will follow them throughout their lives.

From the Government point of view, good child care centers promote employee loyalty, enhance job satisfaction, and provide incentives to attract and retain good employees.

Thank you.

Mrs. COLLINS. Thank you, Ms. Leonard.

Ms. Leonard, for the record I would like for you to tell us what your duties and responsibilities are as the Special Assistant to the Administrator of GSA in charge of child care.

Ms. LEONARD. GSA is—our job is building quality child care centers. I will report directly to Mr. Golden on identifying areas where child care centers are needed. We have now a questionnaire that is out in the land to all kinds of agencies in the Government to assess the need.

I will help assess the need, help identify the space, and to get the process going in a much more timely fashion than we have done in the past. I report directly to Mr. Golden frequently.

Mrs. COLLINS. Thank you.

Can you tell me what GSA's goals are for the year 1988 for establishing new child care centers?

Ms. LEONARD. We have identified approximately 43 potential locations in which we are conducting surveys, and we hope to have, onboard by September of this year, of 1988, 25 plus.

Mrs. COLLINS. Can you tell us where you hope to have those? Will they be in major cities, or what?

Ms. LEONARD. Well, you go where the need is greatest, and yes, the major cities have the greatest Federal presence. We will start in that mode. We also hope to not only bring on that 25, but to have in the process somewhere double that number for the next fiscal year. The need is great.

Mrs. COLLINS. Can you tell us, if you have the information available, how many of those will be brought on line say within the next 6 months, rather than in next September?

Ms. LEONARD. Well, the school year starts in September, and we are aiming for finishing these 25, having them ready——

Mrs. COLLINS. How many are in process? Where are they?

Ms. LEONARD. They are all over the country, Madam Chairman.

Mrs. COLLINS. Well, why do you not submit that information for the record?

Ms. LEONARD. I will. I am sorry. I have a notebook full of information answering all kinds of questions, and I just cannot put my finger on it.

[A document is handed to Ms. Leonard.]

Mrs. COLLINS. It has just arrived.

Ms. LEONARD. Thank you. [Laughter.]

I will give you a sense of some of the centers. New York of course is the largest city with a great Federal presence. Waltham, MA, the Corps of Engineers is going to have a center onsite. In Boston, the new O'Neill Building, the Federal building, where we have some 3,500 employees, will be opening.

In Hartford, the IRS will have an opening before September. It is important that we get this done by the summer, because parents make their plans over the summer, and they are not going to wait on hopefully us opening in September. So we are having a special emphasis on getting these done so parents can make their children's plans in the summer.

Chicago has one coming on the end of January. I went to the opening of the one in Detroit a week or two ago. Milwaukee has one coming on. Louisville, KY, in May. Kansas City, the end of the

summer. Lincoln, NE, in March. Houston, TX, in June. Lakewood, CO, in June. Legunna Niguel in January. That is in California.

There are 14 of them, and they are all over the United States, and they are in those cities that have the most need.

Mrs. COLLINS. All right. Thank you.

Can you tell us, how do you really establish child care centers? How do you identify the sites? It is not only by the size of the metropolitan population. Would it rather be by the number of Federal employees you have in a given metropolitan area?

Ms. LEONARD. I meant by the number of Federal employee population, yes.

Mrs. COLLINS. OK.

Ms. LEONARD. And usually those are in the larger cities, as it so happens. We have an assessment survey, a questionnaire that agencies can give to their employees.

Mrs. COLLINS. May I just interrupt you just a minute?

Ms. LEONARD. Yes; please do.

Mrs. COLLINS. What happens if an agency—how do you test a questionnaire for its accuracy? That is the question I want to ask—that the responses are accurate? Or do you?

Ms. LEONARD. Yes; we do, as best we can. And we try to word the questions so that it lends itself to an accurate answer. We have already gotten some of those back, and the responses—and the way the questions are put seem to work, and they give us the information we need, and they seem to help us in assessing this need.

Mrs. COLLINS. Well, if I may, I would like to point out a problem that we found in the Chicago area, for example, with the Social Security Administration. Questionnaires were done in the Chicago area for the Social Security Administration, and the head of that office gave the questionnaire to every employee, some of whom were beyond child-bearing years, and so forth. So when the result came back, it was not in favor of establishing onsite child care. But when one looks at the number of child-bearing employees who were there and the number of children they had, the opposite result would have been achieved from looking at the response to the questionnaire. How do you avoid that kind of situation? I believe, and I may be wrong, but my personal belief is the reason why it was given to all those employees is because they knew the result that would come out, because the head of the agency did not want onsite child caring in that particular unit.

Ms. LEONARD. Well, there are several agencies where their leaders are not particularly interested in child care. I think that public opinion and the pressure of their employees will change some of those minds.

Mrs. COLLINS. But what will you do at GSA about your questionnaires, if that is going to be your only means of determining whether or not onsite or nearsite child care should be placed in a given city or area?

Ms. LEONARD. I think that as we give out those questionnaires, we have to give a little informational help to the people receiving them, and that they should not go to every employee. That does not make sense to me. And any other instructions that we can give them, so that GSA can get accurate, good information.

And certainly if we look at an area that has 3,500 Federal employees and they come back and they do not want child care, we would take another look and perhaps ask them how they arrived at this. I think you have to be a little sensible about looking at some of this information.

Mrs. COLLINS. Mr. Nielson.

Mr. NIELSON. Yes; first of all, I want to congratulate you for what you are doing. We had seven recommendations in our report, and I would like to go through and mention a few of them and see how you are doing on them.

First of all, before I start that, everything has been beautiful today and there have been no objections, but there is some resistance to what you and Mr. Golden are trying to do within GSA and within other agencies, is there not?

Ms. LEONARD. Some. I think it is lessening. The sheer numbers——

Mr. NIELSON. What kinds of problems are you having, and what can we do to help?

Ms. LEONARD. In GSA, I think that we are attacking our problems, and we have top executives within GSA responsible for this program. I see enthusiasm growing for it, and as we see the need and go out and talk to parents and talk to providers—read the newspapers.

Mr. NIELSON. Do these problems stem from the view that the Federal Government should not get involved in cooperating with civilian agencies? Or the Federal Government should not get involved with States, or the private sector? Is there that kind of an objection?

Ms. LEONARD. I think that kind of an objection is disappearing.

Mr. NIELSON. But have you had problems in that regard?

Ms. LEONARD. No, I have not, personally. I think in the past that has been a deterrent to starting child care centers.

Mr. NIELSON. I would appreciate it if you would give me a list of things that you have had problems with to see if we can help you and your agency, because I do believe you are doing very well.

Our first recommendation was to assign a high-level GSA official who was specifically responsible for onsite day care, and I assume you are that individual?

Ms. LEONARD. Yes.

Mr. NIELSON. And I appreciate that that recommendation has been followed.

Assign within each of GSA's 10 regions officials with overall responsibility for day care. Are you doing that?

Ms. LEONARD. Yes; we had an all-day session last week with those people, and we have weekly conference calls, and we follow very closely and monitor their progress.

Mr. NIELSON. And in that same connection, you are to develop inside expertise. You are doing that, as well?

Ms. LEONARD. Yes.

Mr. NIELSON. The third recommendation: Recognize and meet the statutory responsibility to rent space in public buildings for child care similar to the AFGE in Battle Creek, MI. Have you been doing that?

Ms. LEONARD. I am not quite familiar with Battle Creek——

Mr. NIELSON. Rent space in public buildings for child care? That is something you have yet to do? That is yet to be done?

Ms. LEONARD. Yes; we do that.

Mr. NIELSON. All right, the fourth one was: Work with Federal agencies throughout the country to survey Federal workers concerning their interest and need for onsite child care. You are doing that, I understand?

Ms. LEONARD. Yes; we are.

Mr. NIELSON. Where they demonstrate sufficient need and sufficient Government presence and interest in onsite child care, GSA should present the survey findings to the agencies involved in recommending establishments of specific child care centers.

Ms. LEONARD. Yes; we are doing that.

Mr. NIELSON. No. 6: In determining the feasibility of particular day care centers, full weight should be given to the determination by Congress that such centers may be open to children of non-Federal workers, subject however to priority for Federal workers.

Are you inviting any non-Federal workers to join you where there are not sufficient Federal workers to quite make a center viable? Are you doing that?

Ms. LEONARD. Once we do our needs' assessment and find out the numbers involved who are interested, yes, we would certainly invite.

Mr. NIELSON. If you could maybe justify three-quarters of a center but you needed enough other people to make it fully—you do that?

Ms. LEONARD. That is right; yes.

Mr. NIELSON. And No. 7: With the assistance of other appropriate agencies, GSA should prepare and distribute to interested parties a handbook to assist in establishment of onsite day care. Are you preparing such a handbook?

Ms. LEONARD. We are. We have prepared several parts of it. It is not all together, but we feel it is important to get this information out to the agencies.

Mr. NIELSON. Would you rate yourself an A or an A-minus on this list of seven?

Mrs. COLLINS. Probably an A-plus.

Ms. LEONARD. I would say an A.

Mr. NIELSON. The chairwoman said an A-plus.

Ms. LEONARD. Well, I do not want to brag. I have only been on 6 weeks. [Laughter.]

Mr. NIELSON. I congratulate you very much. I understand you have children yourself, and you are fully aware of how much time is required to take care of children, and I would repeat my previous statement that a 5-to-1 ratio simply is not going to do it.

Ms. LEONARD. I might tell you that GSA is not only encouraging, but putting a lot of pressure on the different regions which have different regulations and codes, to put into place the best of all the regulations and codes. One of them is a 1-to-3 ratio for infants.

Mr. NIELSON. Well, I surely commend you and Mr. Golden and your entire staff. It is a pleasure to have you here.

Ms. LEONARD. Thank you.

Mrs. COLLINS. Ms. Leonard, I was interested when you said the enthusiasm was growing over at GSA for child care. Why is it

growing? You surprised me a little bit, because I thought they were sort of—I know that Mr. Golden has done a tremendous job, but I know that there was some resistance, as has been mentioned.

Ms. LEONARD. Yes; I think there was resistance there. I think there was resistance in other Federal agencies, and I think that many people thought that the Government should not get in the child care business.

Mrs. COLLINS. Well, what has made these people change their minds?

Ms. LEONARD. Well, the turnover of employees, as I mentioned in my talk, and I think just the numbers that are involved. Every family seems to have a child care problem.

Mrs. COLLINS. Well, have you been doing any PR within the agencies, or something like that, to tell them how great child care is and how much better it is to have onsite child care, and all those kinds of things? Or is this just some kind of ground swell of great interest, which I find hard to believe.

Ms. LEONARD. Both. I think the ground swell is there. We read it in the newspapers every day, and I am meeting already with heads of agencies and telling them the pluses, and many of them agree and have come to see——

Mrs. COLLINS. So you are doing a good job of convincing the agency heads that this is needed, to an extent.

Ms. LEONARD. Yes; I think my job is as facilitator and a catalyst and takes in that PR.

Mrs. COLLINS. The costs here on the Hill for child care are pretty expensive. What are the various costs that you have? Do you find that the costs incurred by GSA with respect to the construction, for example, of child care centers is very, very large? And how is it offset, if it is? Is it part of the regular budget, or what?

Ms. LEONARD. It is part of our budget, and we experience different problems. We are taking already built space for other purposes, and some space is easily converted, and others are very difficult and it takes special design and construction know-how to fit it out for a child care center. But it can be done.

Mrs. COLLINS. What do parents have to pay for child care centers? Is it based on the region in which they live? Or are there going to be sort of flat rates across the country, or what? What do you envision?

Ms. LEONARD. No; GSA has no control over the rates.

Mrs. COLLINS. Why? Do you rent the space out to an agency?

Ms. LEONARD. To a provider, or an agency, and they set the rates. The rates are all over the place. In New York City and in other cities where the cost of living is very high, child care rates are very high. Parents make substantial sacrifices to put their children in child care centers.

I have talked to over 100 parents, and I would say the first concern of parents is quality—quality care for their children; second, convenience; and third, cost. In those areas where the cost of living is high, the cost of care is very high.

Mrs. COLLINS. Thank you.

Can you tell me, we just had the Department of Defense here. Can you tell me the extent of your cooperation and coordination

with other Federal agencies, including DOD, as to their child care activities?

Ms. LEONARD. I think the cooperation of all agencies with GSA, and GSA with them, is a key to the success of this program for child care centers for Federal employees. I have already met with the DOD a couple of times, and the ladies that were here testifying this morning, and GSA is ready with any Federal agency to help them in any way.

At this meeting on January 6 with the heads of agencies, we will tell them what we can do to help them take care of their child care needs.

Mrs. COLLINS. Do you know whether there has been any centralized executive branch policy guidance in the developing of child care centers?

Ms. LEONARD. Not that I know of. We have put out some policy guidance for our own use. Beyond that, no.

Mrs. COLLINS. Do you think there is a need for this?

Ms. LEONARD. I think that—do you mean laws for standardization?

Mrs. COLLINS. For standardization.

Ms. LEONARD. No; I think that each region can assess its community's needs. They know the providers. They know the space available. I think that the oversight should be on a local level, on a community level, not out of Washington.

Mrs. COLLINS. Has OMB put out any kind of policy guidance requirements, or any standards, or anything like that?

Ms. LEONARD. I have only been here 6 weeks, and I do not want to plead ignorance on that, but I am not sure.

Mrs. COLLINS. Well, I would like for you to submit the answer to that in writing to the subcommittee. That would be very beneficial to us

Ms. LEONARD. I will.

Mrs. COLLINS. Also, if you would, give us an idea of what overall costs are per region. You do not have to break it down for the 10 regions. What would be the overall costs for opening up a child care center in each of the Federal regions? That would be very helpful just to give us an idea.

Ms. LEONARD. It ranges anywhere from $40,000 to $1 million, depending on what has to be done to that space that we are going to use. Those that we are surveying now and have identified, we are in the process of working up the costs of changing that space.

Mrs. COLLINS. OK. Thank you very much.

[The information follows:]

General Services Administration
Washington, DC 20405

JAN 11 REC'D

December 24, 1987

L. It.

MCT

Dear Madam Chairwoman:

Enclosed you will find the information which was promised, for the record, to the Subcommittee on Government Activities and Transportation at the December 15, 1987, hearing on Child Care.

If you have any questions or comments regarding any of the enclosed items, please contact Robin Graf of my staff, on 566-1250.

With best wishes,

Harold H. Griffin
Associate Administrator
for Congressional Affairs

The Honorable
Cardiss Collins
Chairwoman, Subcommittee on
Government Activities
and Transportation
Committee on Government Opertions
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

43 POTENTIAL SITES TO BE SURVEYED
GSA EXPECTS 25 OF THESE LOCATIONS TO BE OPENED IN FY 88

State	Location (If specified)
New York, NY	Jacobs K. Javits Federal Building
Syracuse, NY	
Waltham, MA	
Boston, MA	Government Center Tip O'Neill Federal Building
Hartford, CT	
Baltimore, MD	Downtown
Philadelphia, PA	Downtown Roosevelt
Pittsburgh, PA	
Richmond, VA	
Atlanta, GA	
Miami, FL	
Louisville, KY	
Chicago, IL	
Ft. Snelling, MN	
Cincinnati, OH	
Cleveland, OH	
Milwaukee, WI	

State	Location (If specified)
Kansas City, MO	South North
Lincoln, NE	
New Orleans, LA	
Ft. Worth, TX	
Houston, TX	Concorde
Denver, CO	Customs House
Lakewood, CO	Federal Center
Ogden, UT	
Laguna Niguel	
Los Angeles, CA	
Sacramento, CA	
Juneau, AK	Federal Building
Boise, ID	Federal Building
Auburn, WA	
Seattle, WA	Federal Center-South
Honolulu, HI	
Las Vegas, NV	
Washington, DC	IRS GSA/National Capital Region FTC (Federal Trade Commission)

State	Location (If specified)
Suitland, MD	Commerce/Census Bureau
Arlington, VA	DOD-Pentagon

PROBLEMS RELATING TO ESTABLISHMENT OF CHILD CARE POLICY/CENTERS

We are in the process of developing policy determinations and working with sponsoring organizations to open child care centers and will no doubt encounter numerous problems, however, at this time one specific situation appears particularly significant. Current Federal law does not permit the payment of personnel "start-up" costs.

Child care is typically a labor-intensive enterprise with limited capital with which to initiate operations in new locations. Very often local or State codes set forth specific staffing requirements along with minimum educational credential requirements for that staff. Beginning a new center generates costs between the time that the doors open and the optimum enrollment is achieved that are simply beyond the reach of many potential operators. The lack of ability of providers to absorb these costs may seriously limit the range of potential providers of child care willing to operate in Federal space.

COSTS TO OPEN CHILD CARE CENTERS

The cost to a Federal agency to open a child care center varies greatly. Construction costs differ according to how much and what type of alterations are needed. In addition, the costs of providing equipment between a Federal agency and the child care provider varies. The following are examples of construction and equipment costs to Federal agencies for child care centers opened in FY 1987:

McNamara Federal Building
Detroit, MI
3827 sq. ft. $35,000 construction

The Learning Center
GSA - Washington, DC
2809 sq. ft. $180,000 construction
23,000 equipment
$203,000

IRS Center
Andover, MA
3000 sq. ft. $250,000 construction
50,000 equipment
$300,000

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

October 30, 1987

MEMORANDUM FOR TERRY GOLDEN
ADMINISTRATOR
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

FROM: GERRY RISO
ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR FOR MANAGEMENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

SUBJECT: Day Care

I read several days ago the announcement on day care with disappointment that we were not made aware that the announcement was being made. That, coupled with the promotional mailing to PCMI members, causes me problems.

At our budget discussion with your staff some 10 days ago, I indicated clearly that a policy framework for extending day care centers throughout the Federal work place needed to be discussed. The concern over costs, the prospects of elitism, the use of public funds for the benefit of fewer than the number who need the program, the selection process of participants, and competition with the private sector were raised at the meeting. I and others from OMB left the meeting believing that GSA appreciated the sensitivity of these questions and that they needed to be discussed in the future. The Commissioner himself specifically agreed discussion was needed. Consequently, I was surprised to see this program was publicly announced so shortly thereafter. Nevertheless, I do not want the failure of GSA to communicate its intentions adequately to denigrate the idea of day care centers and the desirability of the Federal Government being as helpful as possible in setting these up. Therefore, I will be sending to you shortly a series of policy questions. I suggest that these be used to create a policy framework for expanding the program.

Thank you.

cc: Joe Wright
Jim Miller
John Merck
Frank Seidl
Paul Weiss
Associate Administrator, GSA

General Services Administration
Public Buildings Service
Washington, DC 20405

DEC 30 1987

Dear Madam Chairwoman:

I want to take this opportunity to thank you and the members of the Subcommittee for the chance to share with you the current status of the child care initiative of the General Services Administration (GSA). I am most encouraged by the progress we have made to date, and believe that our goals for 1988 are well within reach.

Your support of our efforts, particularly your kind words reported in The Federal Times of December 28, 1987, are especially helpful in fostering a receptive climate within the Federal community for the establishment of on-site child care centers.

During the hearing on December 15, Congressman Nielson inquired as to the status of the seven tasks requested by your committee in an earlier hearing to which Mr. Golden provided testimony. While we have completed most of these items, one, a basic guidebook for Federal agencies' staff and management entitled, "How To Start a Federally Located Child Care Center" has not yet been completed.

Our delay of publication of this booklet has been a purposeful one. As we have developed our organizational experience and expertise, we have learned how to avoid many of the pitfalls that can accompany the start of a new center. We want this handbook to be a reflection of our real experiences, not a recitation of theory. We anticipate forwarding a copy of a draft to you in early February and encourage your comments and suggestions. We are planning to have the handbook ready for printing in March.

We envision this GSA publication covering such topics as: the provision of space; the conduct of a child care needs assessment survey; the role of the sponsoring agency and other topics specifically applicable to child care in the context of the Federal workplace.

Because many excellent materials dealing with the provision of child care have been produced by organizations in both the public and private sectors, we would not seek to duplicate them. Instead, we will include a comprehensive directory of sources of information from Federal, State and local governments and the private sector, along with a bibliography of print and audiovisual materials that would be of help to those seeking to initiate a federally located child care center program.

Once again, thank you for your ongoing interest in the child care initiative of GSA.

With best wishes for a joyous holiday, I remain,

Sincerely,

Barbara M. Leonard

BARBARA M. LEONARD
Special Assistant to the
Administrator for Child Care
and Development

The Honorable
Cardiss Collins
Chairwoman, Subcommittee on Government
Activities and Transportation
Committee on Government Operations
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

General Services Administration
Public Buildings Service
Washington, DC 20405

FEB 29 1988

Dear Madam Chairwoman:

This letter is in further reference to the December 30, 1987, letter to you from Barbara M. Leonard, Special Assistant to the Administrator for Child Care and Development, which transmitted information on the General Services Administration's guidebook on establishing Federal child care centers.

My staff is still drafting the above-referenced guidebook and expects to have it completed by mid-April 1988. In the interim, enclosed is a copy of an outline of the materials to be covered by this publication. Upon completion of the draft, we will provide your office with a copy for review.

We regret the delay in finalizing this project. However, as you know, we are still developing our organizational experience and expertise in this important initiative and certainly want the guidebook to be reflective of this effort.

Should you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to have your staff contact Ms. Ann Everett, of my staff, on (202) 566-1516.

Sincerely,

DUNCAN [illegible]NT HOWARD
Commissioner

The Honorable
Cardiss Collins
Chairwoman, Subcommittee on Government
Activities and Transportation
Committee on Government Operations
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Enclosure

CHILDREN IN THE FEDERAL WORKPLACE: How to Establish a Federal Employees' Child Care Center

Introduction: Building a Quality Workplace: A Major GSA Initiative

This section will describe various GSA efforts to enhance the Federal workplace; make comparisons with the private sector; detail the commitments made to the Congress; and describe the new GSA role as an active partner in establishing child care centers.

Background: Why is Federal Employee Child Care Necessary?

This section will briefly describe the numbers of women in the Federal workforce who have small children; the problems they face with child care; the impact on agency operations; and the benefits, for both employer and employee alike, that accompany an on-site center.

Chapter 1 Child Care Program Authority and Program Goals

This chapter will review and examine the various statutory authorities under which appropriated funds may be used by agencies to establish child care centers; and the various ways in which GSA space can be allocated for child care. The process of determining child care sites to address local child care needs will be generally discussed.

Chapter 2 Program Roles and Responsibilities: Laying the Groundwork for Sound Planning

This chapter will examine and discuss the interrelationship of the sponsoring agency and its management, GSA, employee groups, labor unions and child care providers in establishing a successful child care center. Special considerations related to multi-tenant versus single tenant buildings, and possible partnerships with other-governmental as well as private sector cosponsorship participation, will also be included.

Chapter 3 Assessing the Need for Child Care and Selecting Space

This chapter will address the development of a comprehensive needs assessment questionnaire; the role of management support in its dissemination, completion and collection; compilation and reporting of the results; and the application of the results to the planning and development process. The process of selection of appropriate space, relocation issues, and the applicability of local codes and child care standards will be covered here.

Chapter 4 Child Care Expertise: Where to Find It...

The process of finding child care consultants to assist local organizing committees is the focus here. A model contract for short-term services is included. Tapping local resources: colleges and university Early Childhood Education programs, as well as private resources.

Chapter 5 Facility Development: the "Build Out"

Development of design and layout; the involvement of child care expertise in the process; the process of review and approval; construction contracting.

Chapter 6 The Sponsoring Agencies' Role

Working with the provider to equip the Center is the primary focus here. Suggestions for selection of supplies and equipment are addressed as well.

Chapter 7 The Basis of Good Child Care: A Good Provider

The basis for selection of a good provider offering a sound developmentally-based program is the focus of this chapter. Issues are: the role of a child care consultant in developing the criteria for selection by the organizing committee; soliciting provider interest; compliance with local child care codes and standards as well as Federal nondiscrimination requirements applicable to federally assisted programs; licensing and liability insurance; and employee background checks. A model license for the granting of usage of Federal space for child care will be included.

Chapter 8 Building Services Furnished by GSA

The provision of utilities, security, cleaning and maintenance of the child care space are covered.

Chapter 9 Special Considerations

Child care centers in delegated buildings as well as commercial facilities management contracted facilities; off-site care; employee referral services, where appropriate, will be addressed. Obtaining nonprofit status from the Internal Revenue Service for child care programs will also be covered.

Chapter 10 Marketing the Child Care Service

Techniques for achieving full enrollment, issues of tuition costs, building employee support of the Center will be some of the topics covered.

Appendices, typically forms, will be included.

MAR 7 1988

THE ROLE OF THE GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION IN MAKING CHILD CARE AVAILABLE TO FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Child care in America is not just a good idea, it is a necessity - its time is now. The traditional family; that of the breadwinning father, the breadmaking mother and two breadeating children now comprise only 11% of the population. The ever increasing numbers of women in the workforce either as single parents or as a working spouse have caused significant demands for quality child care. In the Federal workforce, over 700,000 children belong to our employees. Finding quality child care is now the second major concern of parent employees. Searches for quality child care can be difficult and discouraging. Often there is no assurance it will continue.

Employee child care centers are not just a Federal idea. Major corporations are recognizing the need for child care centers and are building them at an ever increasing pace. Statistically we know over 50% of the children born this year will live at some point before their eighteenth birthday in a single parent home. Almost all single parents are forced to work. For some, the struggle to balance work and child raising becomes overwhelming and they fall back on public assistance rather than work at productive jobs. A potential employee is lost..and the Government sustains an ever larger portion of the cost.

Documented studies show employees worry about their child care arrangements while at work. The inability of parents to find quality child care often causes increased leave usage. Concern or worry translates to reduced productivity. As a result, the Government pays for this parental distraction and absenteeism. Studies show that on-site child care centers have reduced employee absentee rates in some private companies by 53%.

The General Services Administration (GSA) actively supports child care because the Government, as a progressive employer, is concerned with making quality child care available. It is becoming a necessity if we are to attract and retain quality employees. The government should be in a leadership role and we intend to make employee child care a priority.

Public Law 99-591, commonly referred to as the "Trible Amendment," 40 U.S.C., Section 490b, authorizes the Government to provide space, services and equipment for child care centers. GSA and Federal agencies are forming partnerships to develop centers. The following questions and answers provide more specific data about our joint efforts.

1. Describe the role of the General Services Administration in making on-site child care available to Federal employees.

Since its establishment in 1949, one of the primary missions of the GSA has been to provide the logistic and administrative support necessary for the efficient and cost-effective operation of the agencies of the United States Government. By facilitating the construction of on-site child care facilities, GSA is actively supporting the mission of the various Federal agencies. The enabling of agencies to make on-site child care available to their employees enhances productivity through: helping to attract higher quality workers, elimination of child care-related concern and stress; lessening of absenteeism; and lowering personnel turnover.

While public interest in Federal job openings remains high, the specialized skills and often-lengthy clearance process required makes turnover an issue worthy of careful scrutiny by Federal agency management. Today, many private sector firms are actively pursuing child care programs for their employees, and for many families, this alone could be a deciding factor in making employment decisions.

As part of its program of enhancement of the Federal workplace, the Quality Workplace Initiative, GSA provides the means for a local assessment of child care needs, the provision of appropriate space for a child care facility commensurate with the locally identified need, and the preparation of that space with the fixtures necessary for a licensed child care facility. The space will be assigned to the sponsoring Federal agency(ies) and GSA will charge the agency(ies) Rent for that space at standard rates.

2. Who is in charge of the GSA program?

Mrs. Barbara M. Leonard is GSA's Special Assistant for the Child Care and Development Program. The responsibility for the implementation of the program rests with the Public Buildings Service (PBS).

However, GSA cannot implement a Federal child care program without the partnership of the Federal community. The Regional Administrator and Assistant Regional Administrator in each region has made child care a priority program. Each GSA region has appointed a Child Care Coordinator who works regularly with Ms. Leonard and the PBS staff. Federal agencies and Federal Executive Boards throughout the country work with GSA to implement child care.

The Learning Center, housed in GSA's Central Office, is a leading example of this partnership. The center is sponsored by three agencies: the Department of Interior, the Office of Personnel Management and GSA. This type of partnership will be the cornerstone of a Federal Child Care Program.

3. Is GSA providing child care services?

No, child care services will be provided by non-government entities expert in the field of early childhood education. Expenses, other than those encompassed by the build-out, are the responsibility of the agency, or agencies whose employees will use the child care center. These are the sponsoring agencies. In a multi-agency building, the coordination of roles and proportional sharing of costs will be required. Furniture and equipment costs are borne by the sponsoring agency(ies), not by GSA. GSA will act as a cosponsoring agency where there is a significant concentration of GSA employees. The cost of child care tuition is paid by those employee parents who choose to purchase the child care service.

4. Why is the provision of on-site child care important to the Federal workplace?

Problems related to child care often are cited as the cause for repeated employee absenteeism or lateness. Concerns over the quality of the care provided, or its proximity to home or work often creates significant stress for employees, particularly working mothers. Working parents are frequently under the greatest stress to balance the dual responsibilities of job and children. It has been estimated that 8 - 10 working days per year are lost by parents dealing with concerns related to the care of their children.

A child care facility on-site solves transportation-related problems, offers the opportunity for parent/child visits or nursing during lunch or work breaks, and generally eliminates those ongoing parental concerns associated with informal child care arrangements. The Government, with respect to child care, is merely acting as any other progressive employer concerned with optimizing worker productivity.

5. What, if any, effect will child care have on employee turnover? Given the numbers of applicants for many Federal jobs, should there be concern for employee turnover?

While precise measurement is difficult, experience in the private sector has shown employer-sponsored child care significantly influences decisions to accept or continue employment.

Many Federal jobs require training and on-the-job experience in order to achieve full productivity. These skills represent an investment of significant resources. Additionally, many otherwise basic jobs require extensive security clearance processes which are costly and time-consuming. Certainly, like the private sector, the Government does have a vested interest in minimizing turnover to the greatest degree possible.

The Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service has indicated that employee turnover will be reduced because of the establishment of a child care center in its Andover, Massachusetts, Service Center. Serious recruitment and training problems have previously inhibited that center.

6. What are the goals, in terms of numbers of centers, of the GSA effort?

GSA is committed to open 25 new child care centers in GSA-controlled facilities by the end of Fiscal Year 1988. We are now monitoring our regional offices' progress on 42 potential centers nationwide in an effort to exceed the target. The following is our list of the 42 centers being tracked as of March 1, 1988:

Javits Building, New York City, New York
Hanley Building, Syracuse, New York
Waltham Center, Massachusetts (Corps of Engineers)
JFK Building, Boston, Massachusetts
Hartford, Connecticut (IRS)
O'Neill Building, Boston, Massachusetts
Philadelphia (Roosevelt Boulevard), Pennsylvania
Philadelphia (Downtown), Pennsylvania
Baltimore (Downtown), Maryland
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Richmond, Virginia
Atlanta (Russell Building), Georgia
Atlanta, (Peachtree Summit), Georgia
Louisville, Kentucky
Chicago (Customhouse), Illinois
Fort Snelling Federal Building, Twin Cities, Minnesota
Cleveland, Ohio
Cincinnati, Ohio
Milwaukee, Wisconsin
Kansas City (North), Missouri
Kansas City (South), Missouri
Lincoln (Denney Federal Building), Nebraska

Denver (Federal Center), Colorado
Ogden (IRS Center), Utah
Fort Worth (Federal Center), Texas
Houston (Concord), Texas
New Orleans, Louisiana
Ala Moana Boulevard, Honolulu Hawaii
North Los Angeles Street, Los Angeles, California
Bonneville Towers, Las Vegas, Nevada
Cottage Way, Sacramento, California
Laguna Nigel, California
Federal Center South, Seattle, Washington
Federal Building, Juneau, Alaska
Seattle (Environmental Protection Agency), Washington
Portland, Oregon
GSA Center, Building 812, Auburn, Washington
Suitland (Commerce-Census), Maryland
Pentagon (Department of Defense), Virginia
GSA Regional Office Building, Washington, D.C.
Federal Trade Commission Building, Washington, D.C.
Internal Revenue Service Building, Washington, D.C.

All 42 centers listed above are now targeted for opening by no later than October 1988. In addition, our regional offices are working on other (unlisted) locations to use as alternates in the event of any unforeseen problems. Our regional offices are also initiating needs assessment surveys in GSA-controlled buildings with a Federal employee population of 500 or more to determine other potential child care facility candidates not previously identified.

7. How are the locations of the centers determined?

The establishment of a viable on-site child care program requires the active ongoing support of the Federal Executive Boards as well as management and employees of the sponsoring agencies. GSA staff has actively sought to build effective working relationships with all parties involved, i.e., Federal employees unions, special interest groups, Senior Executive Associations. Despite the fact that the role of GSA is largely limited to the issues surrounding provision of child care space and construction, we have accepted the role of catalyst to make the on-site child care concept a working, viable reality.

Not only are we assisting agencies in seeking out the best guidance (experts in the child development field) but we are also encouraging the agencies to set and maintain high standards for the centers.

The need for child care is specifically determined on a local basis by means of employee responses to a professionally developed child care needs assessment questionnaire. On the basis of the results of this questionnaire, decisions about the opening of a center, its size and projected utilization can be made. The active interest and support of the sponsoring agency(ies) or the local Federal Executive Board is vital to the development process.

8. What is the typical cost of "build-out" for a child care facility and what alterations are generally provided by GSA?

Based on the preliminary estimates provided by our regional offices for the 42 locations now being monitored, the nationwide average range is approximately $40 - $50 per square foot. Construction will include all fixtures that are permanently built in and, as such, are a part of the real property. The build-out package typically consists of shelving, cabinets, toilets and sinks, utility hookup for kitchen facilities, sprinkler and alarm equipment (as required), painting and surface preparation. All moveable items such as kitchen appliances, furniture, play equipment and learning materials are to be supplied by the sponsoring agency, which in most instances is not GSA.

9. Is the child care offered under this program directed toward higher-graded employees?

No. The costs for tuition at the Federally located centers are generally reflective of those fees charged by other providers in the same jurisdiction providing a similar program for the child.

GSA is establishing a working relationship with the staff of Project Head Start within the Department of Health and Human Services, and is researching available State, local and charitable sources of child care tuition assistance to assure that lower income employees have an opportunity to participate. At present, there is no authority for the use of agency funds for the subsidizing of child care tuition.

Group child care, as contrasted with home-based care, represents a significant cost for all families, as the average cost is approximately $3,000 per year. In higher-cost urban areas, tuition fees are greater to cover increased labor costs.

We have compiled, salary data collected from Federal parents (existing centers in GSA-controlled space) on a voluntary basis, which reflects a broad range of users at various salary levels. This was by no means an exhaustive survey, and reflects those employees who agreed to respond. Additionally, a compilation of typical child care costs for various cities is attached. This data was supplied by the National Association for the Education of Young Children.

10. Why should Federal employees have a child care benefit that is not provided to the majority of American workers?

First, let us clarify that child care is not a benefit for Federal employees. Child care is a service being made available to individual employees to purchase for their children, at a rate which is comparable to those offered within the general community. The Government (GSA and participating agencies) provide the initial build-out and equipment. The continuance of the centers is self supporting through fees charged parents for services.

11. What is GSA doing to promote child care in the Federal Workplace?

GSA has begun and will continue a concerted nationwide marketing effort. The purpose of this effort is to inform agencies of the status of child care in the Federal workplace, stimulate interest in the child care program and advise agencies on the steps they must take to make Federal child care centers a reality.

Through our Regional Child Care Coordinators and our nationwide publicity campaign, we are displaying traveling mural exhibits in the lobbies of Federal agencies and at multi-agency meetings and conferences; disseminating a number of print material including operational guidelines, questions and answers, color brochures and flyers; publishing articles in agency newsletters and Federal magazines, including the March issue of the Government Executive magazine; inviting agency executives to attend forums and conferences on the operational aspects of child care; and, we are planning a number of various activities to promote Federal child care during the Week of the Young Child (April 10 - 16).

We are also actively soliciting support for the child care program. We have met with unions and employee associations to solicit financial support for tuition subsidies and scholarships. We are developing an interagency agreement with the Department of Health and Human Services to act as a consultant for the establishment of child care centers, and lastly, we are addressing Federal Executive Boards, the Federal Administrative Manager's Association, and the President's Council on Management Improvement groups to encourage their support and commitment of resources to the opening of child care centers.

Weekly Child Care Rates
August 1987
Approximated by Resource and Referral Agencies

City	Infants	Toddlers	Pre-School
	DCC	DCC	DCC
Albany NY	$67-125	$ 60-100	$57-100
Atlanta GA	120	30-75	30-75
Boston MA	125-148	90-146	39-110
Chicago IL	85-125	75-90	50-85
Cleveland OH	42-105	30-78	30-78
Columbus OH	45-105	45-90	35-90
Dallas TX	65-120	45-100	45-100
Denver CO	60-110	55-95	50-100
Detroit MI	65-125	65-125	45-100
Greenville SC	35-80	35-80	35-75
Hartford CT	100	70-90	70-90
Houston TX	50-85	50-85	50-60
Indianapolis IN	50-75	37-65	37-65
Kansas City MO	48-100	50	50
Los Angeles CA	58-134	58-134	40-81
Milwaukee WI	79-110	79-110	60-85
Minneapolis MN	100-150	80-100	70-90
Nashville TN	45-90	40-70	40-70
New Orleans LA	45-65	45-50	40-50
New York City NY	45-190	60-150	60-150
Norfolk VA	85-95	50-60	50-60
Oklahoma City OK	50-80	45-65	40-65
Pittsburgh PA	50-100	35-91	35-91
Raleigh NC	35-100	25-85	25-85
San Diego CA	78-111	78-111	56-82
San Francisco CA	90-130	70-80	65-75
Seattle WA	115-150	81	69
St. Louis MO	82	82	60
Miami FL	45-93	35-83	35-83
Tampa Bay FL	30-80	35-75	35-75
Washington DC	52-135	52-125	52-110

DCC = Day Care Center

Single figures are average rates.

Data Provided by the
National Association for the
Education of Young Children

CHILD CARE CENTER COST SUMMARY
FEB. 23, 1988 REV.

REGION NOS.	REGIONWIDE SQ.FT. TOTAL ALL FACILITIES	TOTAL ESTIMATED REGIONWIDE COST ALL FACILITIES	REGIONWIDE COST/SQ.FT. ALL FACILITIES
Region 1&2	14,634	$637,000	$43.53
Region 3	21,300	$1,112,000	$52.21
Region 4	7,600	$380,000	$50.00
Region 5	19,100	$356,200	$18.65
Region 6	19,700	$280,600	$14.24
Region 7&8	26,300	$698,000	$26.54
Region 9&10	41,000	$2,542,262	$62.01
Region W	11,038	$859,660	$77.88
TOTALS	160,672	$6,865,722	$42.73

Mrs. COLLINS. I do not have any further questions at this time. If we have further questions, any members of the subcommittee, we will submit them to you in writing and would expect an early response.

Ms. LEONARD. Please do, and I will get right back to you.

Mrs. COLLINS. All right. Thank you very much. We appreciate your testimony before our subcommittee this morning. The hearing is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:15 a.m., the subcommittee adjourned, to reconvene subject to the call of the Chair.]

APPENDIX

MATERIAL SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

ONE HUNDREDTH CONGRESS SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Congress of the United States

House of Representatives

GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES AND TRANSPORTATION
SUBCOMMITTEE
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS
RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING, ROOM B-350-A-B
WASHINGTON, DC 20515

January 25, 1988

Mr. Frank C. Carlucci, III
Secretary of Defense
Department of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1155

Dear Mr. Secretary:

This is in reference to our December 15, 1987, hearing on the Department of Defense (DOD) child care initiatives for military and non-military personnel. In order to expedite the completion of our investigation, we request that you please furnish the following information by February 16.

1. What is the purpose of the joint DOD committee on child care in the Pentagon established October 1987?

2. What steps has the Joint Committee taken in addressing the challenge of providing child care services for Pentagon employees? What steps are planned?

3. What do you know of any centralized executive branch guidance, or plans to provide it, with respect to improving on-site child care opportunities for civilian employees? How would DOD activities benefit from such guidance?

4. DOD has considerable experience in the establishment and operation of military child-care centers. What aspects of this experience do you believe can be profitably passed on to operation of child-care centers for civilian employees?

5. To what extent have DOD and GSA met to discuss establishment of on-site centers in federally controlled buildings?

6. What is DOD's biggest challenge in establishing child care facilities for civilian personnel?

OASD(PA) DFOISR 88-F-0117

7. What percentage of the 90,000 children participating daily in DOD child care program are civilian-employee related rather than military?

8. How are DOD's child care facilities and programs funded?

9. What types of child care services are offered to military personnel?

10. Describe in some detail the structure used by DOD to manage and monitor its child care programs.

11. What are the minimum qualification that prospective employees (both administrators and caregivers) must possess before being hired?

12. Describe the process by which prospective child care employees are screened before employment.

13. What training is offered to child care employees?

14. What is the projection for further development of on-site child care centers on military installations?

15. How have DOD generally and the Services individually approached the major concern of liability and the related matter of insurance?

16. Why are there different operational policies within the uniformed armed Services? For instance, differences as to maternity leave, ages governing infant and older-child eligibility and the use of appropriated vs. non-appropriated funds?

At the hearing, Lieutenant General Anthony Lukeman testified that a certain Army child care center where child abuse had been reported had been closed and that the military service was looking at its day care problems from top to bottom. It was General Lukeman's understanding that this center (presumably the one at the Presidio) would not be reopened until certain assurance were given that proper safety guidelines were set up for the child care program. On December 15, The New York Times reported that the Presidio day-care center was reopened.

What steps were taken and what assurances were given to prompt the reopening of this facility?

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter. If there are questions concerning this request, please have someone get in touch with the subcommittee office, (LaQuietta Hardy or Miles Romney at 225-7920).

Sincerely,

Cardiss Collins

CARDISS COLLINS
Chairwoman

CC:ljh:eg

CHILD CARE INITIATIVE - QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

1. Q: What is the purpose of the joint DoD committee on child care in the Pentagon established October 1987?

A: The DoD Joint Committee on Child Care was established to address the child care needs of Department of Defense personnel in the National Capital Region.

2. Q: What steps has the Joint Committee taken in addressing the challenge of providing child care services for Pentagon employees?

A: The Committee has:

- Compiled information from GSA, other Federal and state agencies, and private corporations regarding on-site child care.

- Met with GSA regarding use of GSA owned and leased space for child care facilities.

- Toured Federal child care centers in the Washington area.

- Developed and distributed a survey to assess needs of Pentagon area population; results currently being analyzed.

- Completed engineering survey of possible sites for child care center.

Q: What steps are planned?

- The Committee will address the financial and operational aspects of the proposed child care center.

3. Q: What do you know of any centralized Executive Branch guidance, or plans to provide it, with respect of improving on-site child care opportunities for civilian employees?

A: The General Services Administration has been designated the lead agency to assist all Federal Departments and Agencies with child care programs.

Q: How would DoD activities benefit from such guidance?

A: DoD has found our meetings with GSA personnel to be helpful as we address the child care needs of our personnel.

4. Q: DoD has considerable experience in the establishment and operation of military child care centers. What aspects of this experience do you believe can be profitably passed on to operation of child care centers for civilian employees?

A: We believe the staff capabilities at the headquarters level of each of the Military Services will be an extremely important resource as we expand child care services to larger numbers of civilian employees. We also believe that the qualitative guidelines, training materials, and staff training resources will be extremely valuable.

5. Q: To what extent have DoD and GSA met to discuss establishment of on-site centers in Federally controlled buildings?

A: DoD personnel attended a seminar on child care in the Federal workplace sponsored by GSA and have kept GSA apprised of the status of our child care center project.

6. Q: What is DoD's biggest challenge in establishing child care facilities for civilian personnel?

A: The single most difficult problem to solve when establishing a civilian child care facility is identifying facilities and type of care.

7. Q: What percentage of the 90,000 children participating daily in DoD child care programs are civilian-employee related rather than military?

A: We cannot, without extensive on-site surveys, determine the exact number or percentage of the 90,000 plus children already attending DoD child care centers who are civilian employee related. We would expect that the percentage would be less than 10 percent overall, but this would vary widely from center to center.

8. Q: How are DoD's child care facilities and programs funded?

A: Military child care centers are constructed, renovated, and repaired with funds appropriated by the Congress. Additionally, equipment and nonconsumable supplies are funded from government appropriations. We also hire civil servant directors and some administrative staff and the government provides utilities and janitorial/custodial services. The balance of operational costs would include salaries of the caregivers, food, and other consumable supplies, which are funded from parental fees. DoD child care centers in the U.S. may also participate in the Department of Agriculture child care food program.

9. Q: What types of child care services are offered to military personnel?

A: Depending on the size and location of military installations, military personnel have several options with regard to child care services. Over 400 military installations have on-base child care centers offering both day-long care and hourly or drop-in care. Most provide infant services for children 6 weeks or older. The Department also certifies a large number of on-base family day care homes -- currently about 9,300. Many bases also offer referral services to military personnel seeking off-base child care.

10. Q: Describe in some detail the structure used by DoD to manage and monitor its child care programs.

A: Child care programs are decentralized within the DoD. Local installation commanders are responsible for meeting local needs. This includes planning and programming child care center construction, certifying family day care providers, providing referral services, and all other aspects. Major commanders and the headquarters staffs of the Military Services are responsible for technical supervision, to include commander-wide or Service-wide training, inspections, and audits. The Office of the Secretary of Defense provides broad guidelines and funding and staffing policies. The Office of the Secretary of Defense also conducts surveys of military personnel and their spouses, promotes family advocacy programs, provides pay and position classification services, and budgets for adequate resources for child care programs.

11. Q: What are the minimum qualifications that prospective employees (both administrators and caregivers) must possess before being hired?

A: Generally, positions within child care centers fall into one of three categories; (a) professional, (b) nonprofessional technical substantive, and (c) routine day-to-day care.

Professional positions include those of program management, such as the director of a child care facility, and those individual teaching positions requiring full professional knowledge of the theories, principles, and techniques of teaching and learning necessary to address developmental teaching activities involving preschool age children. These types of positions are classified to occupational categories within the nonappropriated fund Universal Annual pay system, whose positions classification structure and pay parallels that format of the appropriated fund General Schedule (GS) system. Professional

pedagogical occupational categories are the GS-1701-O, General Education and Training Series, and GS-1710-O, Education and Vocational Training Series. Administrator positions that include significant business management responsibilities for child care facility operations may be classified to the GS-1101-O, General Business and Industry Series, or, when combined with substantial professional educational responsibilities, the GS-301-O, General Administrative Services Series which accommodates positions whose duties and responsibilities cross broad occupational groupings. For General Schedule equivalent, such as professional jobs within child care organizations, the qualifications standards developed and maintained by the Office of Personnel Management (X-118) apply. Director positions range from UA (GS)-9 to UA (GS)-12. Professional teacher positions are found at levels UA (GS)-5, and 7.

Nonprofessional positions assigned substantive responsibilities for conducting activities designed to contribute to the social, emotional, cognitive and physical development of preschool age children are classified to the Patron Service pay system, a locality prevailing rate pay plan established by the Department of Defense for nonappropriated fund positions involved with providing services directly to customers or patrons of a nonappropriated fund instrumentality.

The positions are rated as Child Care Program Development Assistants. At the entry level PS-4, $5.04/hour, 1987 average, all areas - the Assistant may be responsible for an age group or program but carefully follows all program guidelines and a structured plan of activities developed by the center's director, teacher, or other professional. Assistants at this level are given on-the-job training or formal classroom/workshop instruction. The PS-4 Child Care Program Development Assistant is required to be familiar with the program's standard operating procedures and the developmental care giving techniques used. On-the-job training and workshop instruction should increase the employee's understanding of the program and the necessary skills needed to carry out the established plan of activities.

PS-5 - $5.37/hour, 1987 average, all areas - is the full performance level for positions of this type. Assistants at this level implement a structured plan of activities but are expected to exercise judgment in making the activities more stimulating for the children. PS-5 Assistants are required to have a knowledge of basic child care development strategies and techniques for promoting learning in young children.

At PS-6 - $5.67/hour, 1987 average, all areas - the Assistant operates under broader developmental guidelines. Predeveloped activity plans are generally broader and more flexible than those found at lower levels. PS-6 Assistants have specialized training in child development or have taken courses in early childhood education.

Routine child care is accomplished by Patron Service positions titled, Child Caregiver, rated at PS-2 - $4.39/hour, 1987 average, all areas - and PS-3 - $4.74/hours, 1987 average, all areas.

Child Caregivers at PS-2 perform routine day-to-day child care duties such as receiving children from parents, attending to the physical needs of children by diapering, feeding, and helping with toileting, supervising play, etc. Personnel employed in these entry level positions must be familiar with the procedures established at the center regarding fire safety, emergency evacuation, and first aid. Incumbents are required to undergo training to familiarize themselves with center policies regarding daily routine, illness, discipline, and caregiving techniques, safety practices relative to indoor/outdoor activities and first aid.

PS-3 is the target for full performance Child Caregiver level. Incumbents of positions at this level are involved with such activities as play, rest, snack and meal periods and may serve as leader or primary caregiver in groups which consist of equal or lower level personnel. The PS-3 Child Caregiver must be thoroughly familiar with standard operating procedures and the approved techniques for handling discipline and problem behavior; for comforting a frightened, distressed child. Additionally, knowledge is required of simple play activities and program materials as well as the approved techniques applicable to basic child play and interest centers of the child care facility.

12. Q: Describe the process by which prospective child care employees are screened before employment.

A: In addition to the usual checks with previous employers and applicant provided references, the investigative services of the Military Departments are used to conduct local and national agency checks for any indication of previous deviant behavior inconsistent with employment in a child care program.

13. Q: What training is offered to child care employees?

A: Caregiver personnel are trained at the local installation by the child care center director and staff. Training is offered in curriculum development, discipline, first-aid and safety, cleanliness and sanitation, parental relations, and a wide variety of other topics. Training manuals developed by the DoD, with the assistance of the then Department of Health, Education and Welfare, are available to all child care centers for either group or individual self-paced instruction. The Department also uses in-house training teams and contractor-provided training at local installations. Additionally, child care center directors and their staffs are offered training at both Services' workshops and regional or national conferences such as those held by the

Military Early Childhood Alliance and the National Association for the Education of Young Children. The Department also encourages all child care employees to attain credentials or degrees in early childhood development.

14. Q: What is the projection for further development of on-site child care centers on military installations?

A: We estimate that construction of 15-20 child care centers per year on military installations over the next 4 or 5 years will satisfy most of the needs of military personnel for on-base child care services. This projection is, of course, contingent upon the availability of funding for military construction.

15. Q: How have DoD generally and the Services individually approached the major concern of liability and the related matter of insurance?

A: On-base child care centers are in essence self-insured by the DoD. Family day care home providers are individually liable and may secure insurance from the private sector where available. The Army offers liability insurance to family day care providers through a self-funded insurance pool.

16. Q: Why are there different operational policies within the uniformed Armed Services? For instance, differences as to maternity leave, ages governing infant and older-child eligibility and the use of appropriated vs. nonappropriated funds?

A: The DoD provides broad policy guidelines which in some cases may be implemented somewhat differently by each of the Military Services. The DoD does, however, insist on minimum standards. In decentrally funded and administered programs such as child care, there are bound to be differences, not only among the Uniformed Services but among local installations as well.

17. Q: What steps were taken and what assurances were given to prompt the reopening of this (Presidio) facility?

A: An Army Child Care Evaluation Team (ACCET) went to the Presidio 4-7 November 1987 to look at all facets of child care programs at the installation and their compliance with DoD and Army standards. This evaluation team was composed of child development, fire, engineer, health, safety and operational management experts who are inspecting child development operations throughout the Army. The Presidio of San Francisco Child Care Program was the first to be visited by the ACCET. This evaluation team concluded that child caregiver training was incomplete; that many fire and safety standards were not being

met; that health conditions were unsatisfactory; and that the level of risk to children was unacceptable.

In light of the findings at the Presidio and in the best interest of the children in care, the four facilities of the Presidio Child Development Center were to be closed 20 November 1987. This closure was delayed until 25 November 1987 to allow parents and Center staff additional time to make child care arrangements.

By order of the U.S. Forces Command Commander, Army personnel with experience and expertise in a broad spectrum of operational and management areas were detailed to the Presidio to assist in correcting many items necessary to maintain child care at the installation. Hiring of a new CDS coordinator is in progress. CDS staff detailed by FORSCOM will continue to work at the Presidio until a new CDS coordinator is hired.

The Major Commands (MACOMs) have responsibility for ensuring the safety of children in the Child Development Centers at their installations. To accomplish this mission, multi-disciplinary teams that mirror the Department of the Army ACCET are being formed at MACOM level. MACOMs will be provided with a single source document containing all child care evaluations criteria in functional compliance areas. Joint ACCET/MCCET training for the application of the evaluation criteria will be conducted, and the evaluation criteria will be validated. These teams with the quality assurance mission both expedite addressing shortfalls in our Child Development Services programs and facilities and ensure the health, safety and well-being of Army children while they are in our care.

A Forces Command Team with Headquarters Department of the Army representation reinspected the Presidio facilities Friday, 11 December 1987, and verified compliance with minimum standards. Two Child Development Center facilities reopened 14 December 1987. The other two facilities are no longer utilized for child care services.

Additionally, a preoccupancy inspection of the newly constructed Child Development Center at the Presidio was conducted on 5 February 1988. This facility will replace current facilities. Corrective actions recommended requiring additional funding and authority. Request for this authority is being prepared. The new facility will open when corrective actions are completed. A March-April time frame is anticipated.

ARMY CHILD DEVELOPMENT SERVICES (CDS)

QUESTION: **Why does the Army emphasize child care programs?**

ANSWER: Child care services are required within the military setting to reduce the conflict between parental responsibilities and unit mission requirements. Army families do not have the stability of established neighborhoods or the proximity of relatives that allow a constant and reliable child care plan.

QUESTION: **Who uses Army child care services?**

ANSWER: Child care is essential for Army sole parents, dual-service couples and Army families with working spouses. More than 116,000 soldiers, including approximately 79,000 enlisted soldiers, and 16,200 sole parent and dual military sponsors utilized Army child care services in FY 86.

QUESTION: **How large is the Army's child care program?**

ANSWER: There are currently 296 Army child development centers and approximately 6,600 Family Child Care (FCC) Homes providing services at 173 locations world-wide. In excess of 138,000 children ages 4 weeks to 12 years received care in FY 86. Most installations continue to have an unmet demand for service.

QUESTION: **Why can't the Army use child care services available in the private sector/community?**

ANSWER: Child care operations in the private sector/community are generally not a viable option to provide the support required by Army families for the following reasons:

- -Most facilities located too far from post.
- -Fees generally too high for young soldiers.
- -Hours of operation not responsive to military requirements.
- -Many filled to capacity and have long waiting lists.
- -Not generally available overseas/language barrier.
- -Services very limited for infants/toddlers.
- -Hourly services not available to support Army volunteers.

QUESTION: **How do Army child care rates compare with civilian child care rates?**

ANSWER: Civilian community rates for full day pre-school age care are approximately $3,000 per year. This cost is too high for young soldiers, and fees for infant, toddler and hourly services (when these services are available) are beyond the reach of most soldiers e.g., private sector infant care ranges for $90 - $150 per week. The Army's policy is to provide accessible and affordable child care services to all active duty soldiers regardless of rank. The average cost for Army child care services, including meals and other related charges for all age groups is approximately $2,400. This rate is approximately a 20% price differential over the most prevalent type (full day preschool age) of center care provided by the private sector.

QUESTION: **Why is it necessary to have CDS minimum standards?**

ANSWER: CDS minimum standards ensure consistent levels of child care services Army-wide and minimize command liability through monitored compliance assurance procedures. A GAO report on military child care (Jun 82) cited the need to "establish and enforce standards for healthy, safe, and educationally sound child care operations." As a result, DOD directed each Service "to develop policies to ensure that child care programs are not custodial in nature, but contribute to all aspects of the development of children in military families" (Aug 82). These policies are now contained in AR 608-10 Child Development Services which defines minimum standards in the area of fire, health, safety, construction, nutrition and developmental programming. Initiatives contained in the Army Family Action Plan support implementation of these minimum standards.

QUESTION: **How do Army standards compare with State standards?**

ANSWER: Army standards are a composite of all the State child care regulations and applicable Federal directives. This is necessary since States vary widely in requirements, and there are no equivalent regulatory agencies in OCUNUS locations. Army fire standards are more stringent to offset the reduced numbers of staff required by the Army. (Example: the Army adult/child ratio for infants is 1/5 vs the National Life Safety Code adult/child ratio of 1/3 for infants.) Generally, however, Army standards fall into the 66 percentile relative to State standards. Installation CDS programs may choose to meet State standards in addition to, but not in lieu of Army standards.

DACF-FSC
Oct 87

INFORMATION PAPER

DACF-FSC
13 Oct 87

SUBJECT: Army Child Development Center Programs

FACTS:

1. The Child Development Services (CDS) center-based system consists of child care services offered by 292 Child Development Centers at 173 Army locations world-wide. Services include full-day care up to 11 hours per day, part-day care up to five hours per day, and hourly care for children attending on an intermittent basis. During FY 86 some 107,314 children (approximately 25,000 at any given time) received care in child development centers.

2. A 1982 Army Child Care Survey, recommended by the General Accounting Office (GAO) and directed by the Department of Defense indicated that only 1% of Army Child Development Centers met minimum health, fire and safety standards. An aggressive facilities upgrade program has resulted in 78% of Army child development centers now meeting minimum standards. Remaining facilities are under waiver pending replacement with new construction.

3. Approximately 9% of the center based programs are currently located in newly constructed facilities with another 35 new facilities now under construction.

4. Program initiatives include:

a. Child development center standard designs.

b. Standard job descriptions.

c. Competency-based caregiver standard training modules.

d. Automation software package to facilitate recordkeeping.

e. Revised regulatory guidance (AR 608-10).

f. Nationally recognized caregiver credentialing program.

g. Assessment tool for minimizing the risk of child abuse in child development centers.

APPROVED BY: COLONEL MICHAEL M. MORSE Ms. Guenther/325-0710

INFORMATION PAPER

DACF-FSC
27 Oct 87

SUBJECT: Army Family Child Care (FCC)

FACTS:

1. The U.S. Army's quarters-based or Family Child Care (FCC) system is comprised of in-home care provided by adult family members occupying government owned or leased housing or privately owned housing on military installations which have been certified for program participation. Implementing the FCC program is the prerogative of the installation or community commander.

2. A General Accounting Office Report (1 June 1982), "Military Child Care Programs: Progress Made, More Needed", recommended the use of such homes with proper monitoring, as an adjunct to child development centers. In response, the Department of Defense Child Care Action Plan required the Services to establish FCC guidelines. AR 608-10, Child Development Services, Chapters 1-4 and 6, published Oct 83, clearly outlines FCC requirements.

3. During FY 86, 6,659 FCC homes provided care for more than 30,000 children. This reflects an increase of over 4,388 homes (193%) and an increase of 23,637 children (334%) served since 1983. The rapid growth is the result of a Family Program funding initiative to provide support personnel and program materials necessary to establish or expand the FCC operations at all installations.

4. In FY 86 the Army's NAF Risk Management Program (RIMP) extended liability insurance to all providers certified IAW AR 608-10.

5. Program initiatives include:

a. Standardization of management job descriptions.

b. Implementation of a FCC Standard Training Plan.

c. Increasing FCC enrollment in the USDA Child Care Food Program.

d. Development of a FCC Directors Handbook and standard training and orientation briefings.

e. Development of a FCC automation software package.

f. Revision of FCC regulatory guidance.

6. In addition to increasing the availability of child care, this program is a major source of family member employment.

APPROVED BY: COLONEL MICHAEL M. MORSE Ms. Smith/325-0710

INFORMATION PAPER

DACF-FSC
27 Oct 87

SUBJECT: Supplemental Programs and Services

FACTS:

1. Supplemental Programs and Services (SPS) is the newest of the three Child Development Services (CDS) delivery systems. It is designed to augment and support center-based and quarters-based CDS systems and integrates common elements of the three CDS systems.

2. The SPS system provides a vehicle for expanding child care services which do not lend themselves to center-based or quarters-based systems. The ability of the center-based and quarters-based systems to meet the demand for child care is limited by construction dollars, number of housing units available for FCC homes, and the labor pool available to meet the needs of both systems. The SPS system will provide low cost alternatives to increase the availability of child care and consolidate services which are applicable to all three CDS systems. Many of these programs and services support the child care needs of junior enlisted families.

3. The SPS system provides two categories of services, essential and optional. Essential services will be implemented on a phased in basis at all installations and will be consistent Army-wide. These services will include: Child Care Resource and Referral, Central Enrollment Registry for all CDS systems, School-Age/Latch Key (SA/LK) Programs, Babysitter Information and Referral, Training and Placement of Persons Providing Gratitous Services (Volunteers) in CDS systems, and Parent Education Programs. Optional services may be implemented as necessary on installations which have a demonstrated unmet child care need. Optional services may include: Short Term Alternative Child Care, Volunteer Care in Unit Settings, Parent Co-ops, Special Interest Programs, Child Care for Sick Children, Off-Post CDS Outreach Homes jointly certified by the Army and the State or host country, Foster Grandparent Program, and Child Care Services for Civilian Employees.

4. An SPS director and an SPS operations clerk have been approved for APF funding on installations with more than 2,000 children. Implementation of this new CDS delivery system will be over a five year period (FY 87-FY 92).

APPROVED BY: COLONEL MICHAEL M. MORSE Dr. Moss/325-0710

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
OFFICE OF THE ADJUTANT GENERAL
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22331

REPLY TO ATTENTION OF

13 SEP 1984

DAAG-PSY

SUBJECT: CDS Individual Education Plan (IEP) Implementation

SEE DISTRIBUTION

1. All Child Development Services (CDS) personnel will receive training to ensure execution of their duties and responsibilities at a level supportive of program objectives.

2. The Army Family Action Plan, Issue #35c, reflects the concern that staff training impacts directly on quality of child care provided in Army CDS programs. Installation/communities should begin implementation of Individual Education Plans (IEP) NLT 1 Oct 84 for all center-based direct services and management personnel as a means of ensuring a minimal level of training and ongoing inservice training.

3. An IEP training packet (includes implementation guidance/format) and supporting training materials are being provided by HQDA to each installation/community. The Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale (ECERS) with accompanying trainer's manual and filmstrip must be entered in CDS property books. DOD Manual 6060 Series, "Training Manuals for Child Caregivers on DOD Installations" are available in bulk quantities through normal publication channels. Adequate quantities are available to meet all installation needs.

4. Following completion of the IEP Initial Training Requirement, each employee will meet with the CDS coordinator/director on an annual basis to assess and determine needs for ongoing inservice training (AR 608-10, para 3-20d). Training options will include readings, workshops, observations, classroom/facility assessments, and special projects. The Inservice Training Record format will be used for this purpose. A minimum of two training hours per month is required.

5. Training will be related to CDS program type, the employee's age group assignment, and the employee's competency level.

6. Ongoing training will include the DOD Manual 6060 Series and regularly scheduled classroom/facility assessments using the ECERS. Additional topics for training may be selected from, but are not limited to, subjects listed in AR 608-10, Figure 3-2, CDS Training Subject Block Indexes. Topics should reflect changing requirements and emphasis in support of the Army Family Action Plan as per DAAG-PSY guidance.

DAAG-PSY
SUBJECT: CDS Individual Education Plan (IEP) Implementation

7. Appropriate resources, e.g. DOD Manual 6060 Series, early childhood program materials, professional journals and newsletters and audiovisual training aids will be available to all CDS personnel.

8. On-site orientation training for newly hired center-based staff will not be counted as part of the 38 hours of specialized instruction (Initial Training Requirements) required during the first six months of employment.

9. Employees will use staff training materials and plan and prepare activities for asssigned areas during daily child nap and rest periods.

10. Overtime payment for training is in violation of law and Comptroller General decisions. CDS training may continue during presently utilized time frames, e.g. evenings, weekends; however employee work schedules may need to be adjusted in order to avoid situations which would require overtime pay for training.

11. CDS coordinators/directors will routinely interact with children and role model program activity procedures as an element of ongoing staff training.

12. IEPs will be reviewed at least semiannually and CDS training will be documented in the employee's personnel file.

13. All regularly scheduled center-based personnel will attend, at a minimum, monthly staff meetings. Attendance should be documented.

14. Employees will be given copies of IEP training records for reciprocal use at other Army CDS programs.

15. IEPs will be established for Family Child Care (FCC) providers and center-based CDS support personnel, e.g. food service workers, desk clerks, NLT 1 Oct 85. Guidance/formats will be provided by HQDA at a later date.

FOR THE ADJUTANT GENERAL:

JOHN W. WOLTERSLORF, JR.
LTC, GS
Chief, Child Development
Services Division

4 Enclosures:
IEP Training Packet
Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale (ECERS)
ECERS Training Guide
ECERS Filmstrip and Cassette

DISTRIBUTION:

MACOM CDS Coordinators (1 each)
Installation CDS Coordinators (1 each)

U. S. MARINE CORPS CHILD CARE PROGRAM

FAMILY PROGRAMS BRANCH
HEADQUARTERS MARINE CORPS (MHF)
WASHINGTON, DC 20380-0001

SANDRA EVANS
CHILD CARE PGM MANAGER
(202) 694-1834/2896

USMC CHILD CARE PROGRAM

OFFERS CHILD CARE SERVICES ON 17 INSTALLATIONS

PROVIDES HOURLY, PART-DAY, AND FULL-DAY CHILD CARE SERVICES FOR CHILDREN AGES 6 WKS - 12 YRS

INCLUDES CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTERS, PRESCHOOLS, DROP-IN CARE PROGRAMS, AND FAMILY DAY CARE HOMES

ENSURES THROUGH PROGRAM STANDARDS, THE BASIC HEALTH, SAFETY, AND WELL-BEING OF CHILDREN

ESSENTIAL TO FAMILIES AND A SUPPORT TO THE MISSION

PROMOTES DUTY EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY

REDUCES LOST DUTY TIME

PROVIDES SAFE APPRORIATE ENVIRONMENTS FOR CHILDREN

ENABLES SPOUSES TO WORK AND TO VOLUNTEER

ALLOWS PARENTS TO RECREATE

CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTERS *

FACILITIES ON 17 INSTALLATIONS, CAPACITY EXCEEDS 4000 CHILDREN

MOST FACILITIES HAVE WAITING LISTS FOR FULL-DAY CARE

MARINE CORPS PROGRAM GUIDANCE CONTAINED IN MCO 1710.30B ADDRESSES:

DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRAM	FACILITY STANDARDS
STAFF/CHILD RATIOS	EQUIPMENT NEEDS
STAFF TRAINING	NUTRITION
HEALTH AND SAFETY	PARENT INVOLVEMENT

77

MORE THAN 70% OF EMPLOYEES ARE MILITARY SPOUSES

FEES KEPT LOW ENOUGH TO ENABLE ALL FAMILIES TO USE PROGRAM

NEW FACILITIES PLANNED AT 10 INSTALLATIONS THROUGH FY91

* INCLUDES PRESCHOOL AND DROP-IN CARE PROGRAMS

FAMILY DAY CARE HOMES

OPERATED IN BASE HOUSING BY PRIVATE INDIVIDUALS, USUALLY SPOUSES

CARE FOR NO MORE THAN 6 CHILDREN INCLUDING PROVIDER'S OWN CHILDREN

CERTIFIED AND INSPECTED BY LOCAL COMMAND

PROGRAM EXPECTED TO GROW, AVAILABLE NOW ON ATLEAST 6 INSTALLATIONS

NUMBER OF HOMES CERTIFIED MARINE CORPS-WIDE EXCEEDS 100

78

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FOR CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTERS

FY89

MCAS TUSTIN CA
MCLB BARSTOW CA
MCAS CHERRY POINT NC
MCLB EL TORO CA
CAMP LEJEUNE NC
MCAGCC 29 PALMS CA

(2 PROJECTS REMOVED, MCAS BEAUFORT AND MCRD SAN DIEGO)

FY90

MCDEC QUANTICO VA

(1 PROJECT REMOVED, MCRD PARRIS ISLAND SC)

FY91

MCAGCC 29 PALMS CA
MCAS YUMA AZ
MCLB ALBANY GA

(NO DECISION ON "LOST" FY89/90 PROJECTS MOVING INTO FY91 PROGRAM)

79

USMC COMMANDS WITH CHILD CARE PROGRAMS

MCB CAMP PENDLETON CA *
MCAGCC TWENTYNINE PALMS CA *
MCDEC QUANTICO VA *
MCRD SAN DIEGO CA
MCLB BARSTOW CA *
MCAS TUSTIN, CA
MCAS YUMA AZ *
MCAS BEAUFORT SC
MCAS IWAKUNI JAPAN
MCB CAMP LEJEUNE NC
MCB CAMP BUTLER OKINAWA
MCRD PARRIS ISLAND SC
MCLB ALBANY GA *
MCAS EL TORO CA
MCAS KANEOHE BAY HI
MCAS CHERRY POINT NC
MCAS NEW RIVER NC

* COMMAND OPERATES A FAMILY DAY CARE HOME PROGRAM

LOCATIONS OF USMC CHILD CARE PROGRAMS

INSTALLATION	# CENTERS	CAPACITY	WAIT LT	FDCH
MCAS CH PT NC	2(1PO)	355(130)		
MCB CP LEJ NC	4(1PO)	492(122)	***	
MCCDC QUAN VA	2(1PO)	172(42)		53
MCAS N RIV NC	2	134		*
MCAS BEAUF SC	2	274		
MCRD PR IS SC	2	190	***	
MCLB ALBNY GA	3	158		3
MCAS EL TR CA	1	440	***	
MCAS TUSTN CA	1	120		
MCRD S DGO CA	2	110	***	
MCAGCC 29P CA	2	236	***	12
MCLB BRSTW CA	1	75		5
MCAS YUMA CA	1	94		24
MCB CP PEN CA	6	737	***	30
MCAS K BAY HI	3	243	***	
MCAS IWKNI JA	1	98		
MCB CP BUT JA	5(2PO)	255(120)		USAF
MCFC K CTY MO	0	0		*

* PLAN TO INITIATE FAMILY DAY CARE HOME PROGRAM
*** WAITING LIST EXCEEDS 100 NAMES (12/86)

81

NAVY CHILD DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

82

CAROLEE CALLEN
HEAD, CHILD DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
NMPC-651D
(A) 224-0598

DECEMBER 1987

86

CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

NAVY'S COMMITMENT

CURRENT PROGRAM

FAMILY HOME CARE

- o THE NAVY IS STRONGLY COMMITTED TO MEETING CHILD CARE NEEDS OF SERVICE PERSONNEL
  - INCREASING NUMBERS OF SINGLE PARENTS AND DUAL MILITARY COUPLES
  - ECONOMIC FACTORS REQUIRE MORE SPOUSES TO WORK OUTSIDE THE HOME
- o CIVILIAN CENTERS CANNOT GENERALLY MEET NEEDS OF NAVY FAMILIES DUE TO
  - INACCESIBILITY
  - HIGH CHARGES
  - LIMITED SERVICES
  - TRANSIENT NATURE OF MILITARY LIFE
- o NAVY CHILD CARE CENTERS PROVIDE
  - INFANT CARE
  - FULL DAY CARE
  - HOURLY RATE
  - PRESCHOOL
  - BEFORE AND AFTER SCHOOL CARE
- o TWENTY SIX NEW FACILITIES BUILT SINCE 1982. EQUIPMENT TO MEET HEALTH/ SAFETY REQUIREMENT PURCHASED

CURRENT NAVY PROGRAM

- o REVISED INSTRUCTION READY FOR SIGNATURE
  - CHANGES CHILD CARE TO CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTERS
  - ESTABLISHES REQUIREMENT FOR ANNUAL ASSESSMENT
  - UPDATE FIRE PROTECTION/CONSTRUCTION CRITERIA
  - ESTABLISHES TRAINING/RECORD KEEPING REQUIREMENTS
  - FAMILY HOME CARE AS ADJUNCT OF CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTERS
- o GS OR UA CENTER DIRECTOR RESPONSIBLE FOR LOCAL PROGRAM
- o PARTICIPATION IN NATIONAL PROGRAM FOR ACCREDITATION
- o CAREGIVER TRAINING PROGRAM DEVELOPED
- o GUIDANCE ON PERSONNEL SCREENING AND CHILD ABUSE REPORTING ISSUED 1985
- o PROGRAM HAS GROWN TO 112 CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTERS SPONSORED BY 87 COMMANDS
  - SERVE APPROXIMATELY 20,000 CHILDREN A DAY
  - WAITING LIST OF OVER 4,000 CHILDREN
  - 60-70% OF CAREGIVERS ARE SPOUSES

FAMILY HOME CARE

- o SUPPLEMENT TO, NOT SUBSTITUTE FOR CENTER BASED CARE
- o VIEWED AS MOST VIABLE OPTION FOR:
  - REDUCING WAITING LIST
  - MEETING 24 HOUR NEEDS
  - CARE FOR MILDLY ILL CHILDREN
  - RESPITE CARE
- o OPERATIONAL POLICY INCORPORATES FEDERAL, STATE AND DOD RECOMMENDATIONS
- o INCORPORATED UNDER NAF CENTRAL FUND INSURANCE PROGRAM
- o KEY TO PROGRAM SUCCESS IS QUALIFIED MONITOR AT LOCAL LEVEL

BW

TALKING PAPER

ON

AIR FORCE CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

1. DISCUSSION:

- Program offered at all bases with dependent population large enough to support program
  - -- Child development centers at 125 bases; preschool program at 111
  - -- Serve over 32,000 children per day
  - -- Provide care for children 6 weeks through 10 years of age
    - --- 6-week care offered at third of the bases
  - -- Offer hourly, part-day, full-day, evening, and weekend service
    - --- Hourly care represents a third of daily attendance; regular care, two-thirds
    - --- Most open for mobilizations and alerts
  - -- Provide meals and snacks which meet US Department of Agriculture (USDA) nutritional requirements
- Program supported by combination of user fees (nonappropriated funds) and appropriated funds
  - -- Fees and charges 10 to 15 percent less than in civilian centers
    - --- On some bases, fees reduced for second and third child
  - -- Director's salary, utilities, maintenance, and some equipment and supplies paid with appropriated funds
- High priority has been placed on improving quality
  - -- Annual training for directors
  - -- Regulation continuously revised

-- Most eligible bases enrolled in the USDA Child Care Food Program or the Air Force Welfare Board (AFWB) Food Program

-- Annual 2-week course for child care directors at the University of Texas

- Efforts continue to increase capacity and quality of facilities

-- Since 1974, one-third child care facilities have been expanded or replaced

-- DOD funding policy now requires construction to be from appropriated funds

--- Child care construction has competed favorably in MCP

--- 35 projects in FY 83-87

- Air Force is expanding child care services by implementing family day care programs

-- Over 60 bases with active program

-- Over 20 bases starting up in FY 88

-- The Air Force Functional Management Inspection Team (FMI) conducting visits at 23 bases on family day care programs (Jul 87-Jan 88)

-- HQ AFMPC/DPMSPR, DPMSK, DPMSCI, and JA attempting to obtain insurance coverage Air Force-wide for family day care providers

--- Slow process and doesn't look promising

- Bottom line

-- Child development programs are providing a needed service to Air Force families

2. ACTION OFFICER: GS-12, Ms Craig/DPMSPR/74045